

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT
AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BR50 Copyright No.

Shelf, S8

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

AT THE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Being Addresses delivered at the Sunday Morning Services of the
Students' Christian Association *Ann Arbor Mich*

ANN ARBOR, MICH.
THE REGISTER PUBLISHING COMPANY
The Inland Press
1893

39 1234

BR 50
.S8

Copyright
STUDENTS' CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION
1893

EDITOR'S NOTE.

The Sunday morning services of the Students' Christian Association, inseparably connected, in the remembrances of the older Alumni, with the University Chapel, are now held in the auditorium of Newberry Hall. Attended mainly by students of the University, they bring together audiences varying in numbers from one hundred and fifty to four or even five hundred. The programme of the exercises consists of singing, reading of the Scriptures, and an address, from fifteen minutes to half an hour in length, upon some topic germane to the purposes of the Association.

The addresses which are heard at these services are various in character. Sometimes they are appeals by members of the Association in the interest of specific objects, sometimes informal talks by religious workers who are visiting in the city. At somewhat irregular intervals members of the Faculties appear upon the programme. The President of the University, in accordance with an established custom, delivers at the beginning of each year what is known as the Annual Address.

The twenty addresses of which the body of this volume is composed, were delivered by the President and by members of the University Faculties. The President's Annual Address, given at the beginning of last year, appears on pages 141-150. The remaining addresses form a series of which it will be necessary to speak in some detail.

The series had its origin in a suggestion that the Association avail itself of the Sunday morning services to obtain a record of the religious thought of the University. Most of the University instructors, it was pointed out, were interested, speculatively as well as practically, in matters of religion. Among them a great deal of quiet but active thinking about religious questions was continually going on, of which students had but occasional intimations. Why should not the Sunday morning exercises be made a channel through which this thought could find expression? The suggestion was taken up and acted upon. Provided with a list of topics, a committee of the Association called upon members of the University teaching force and asked them to prepare papers for the Sunday morning services. The requests met with an immediate and hearty response, so that in February, 1892, the committee was able to prepare and announce a programme of ten addresses to extend through the next four months. The series, begun Feb. 14 with a paper by Prof. Carhart on "God and Nature" (p. 110), was brought to a close May 15 with the address by President Angell which stands at the beginning of the present collection.

During this time each paper after it had been delivered, was published in pamphlet form as a supplement to the Monthly Bulletin of the Association, and sold to the students at a nominal price. The pamphlets were readily disposed of, and at the close of the year there appeared to be a demand for a more permanent and dignified issue of the addresses. Since, however, the material was not sufficient to form a volume of any considerable bulk, it seemed best, by arranging for a second series of addresses, to increase the amount to the requisite proportions. The efforts of the committee were again rewarded,

and during the months of March, April, May, and June, 1893, nine more papers were prepared and read.

The twenty addresses, including the Annual Address of the President referred to above, of which the body of this volume is made up, have now all been accounted for. There remains to be noted the article by Prof. D'Ooge on "The Religious Life of the University," which stands as an introduction to them. This was prepared at the request of the committee of the Association especially for the place which it occupies.

The work of the editor has consisted simply in classifying the material put into his hands and in endeavoring to see it safely through the press. In the latter task he has not been in every particular as successful as he could have wished. Errors have crept in, for some of which he is responsible, for others not. The most serious of them, because they involve the important matter of record, are the two dates on pages 51 and 60. The first should be April 3, 1892, the second March 27. Annoying typographical perversities are also to be found on page 72 in the fourth line from the bottom of the page, on page 137, line 14, and on page 152, line 13. The classification does not pretend either to strictness or consistency. If it shall seem to bring together the topics which are more closely related in thought, its purpose will have been accomplished.

ANN ARBOR, July, 1893.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Religious Life of the University. By Prof. Martin L. D'Ooge.....	viii.
I.	
HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.	
Christianity and Other Religions Judged by Their Fruits. By President James B. Angell.....	3
Primitive and Modern Christianity. By Prof. F. W. Kelsey.	15
The Force of Christianity in United States History. By Prof. A. C. McLaughlin.....	23
The Influence of the Roman Empire on the Growth of Christ- ianity. By Prof. J. C. Rolfe.....	39
II.	
SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.	
Christianity as a Social Force. By Prof. H. C. Adams.....	51
Christianity and Democracy. By Prof. John Dewey.....	60
Christianity and the Newspaper. By Prof. F. N. Scott.....	70
III.	
SCIENCE AND RELIGION.	
Religious Studies in Chemical Science. By Prof. A. B. Pres- cott.....	89
How has Biological Research Modified Christian Conceptions? By Prof. V. M. Spalding.....	96
God and Nature. By Prof. H. S. Carhart.....	110
The Methods of Science Applied to Christianity. By Prof. W. J. Herdman.....	124

IV.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

The Expanding Power of Christianity. By President James B. Angell.....	141
A Pedagogical View of Some New Testament Sermons. By Prof. B. A. Hinsdale.....	151
The Physician as a Christian. By Prof. C. B. Nancrede.....	165
Why Should a Teacher be a Christian? By Dr. E. E. Brown.	178
Sic Utere Tuo ut Alienum non Lædas. By Prof. F. R. Mechem.....	191
The Parable of the Prodigal Son. By Prof. B. M. Thompson.	204
Sacred Music. By Prof. A. A. Stanley.....	209
The Right of Dissent Within the Church. By Prof. F. M. Taylor.....	221
The Religious Condition of South America. By Prof. J. B. Steere.....	238

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF THE UNIVERSITY.

The unwritten and unknown history of a religious life must, in the nature of the case, be the more essential element of such a history. This truth applies not only to individuals but also to communities, and with added force. Especially is this true of the religious life of such a community as is found within the halls of a university. Because, account for it as we may, there seems to be strange reluctance on the part of young men in college to be outspoken and pronounced in their religious convictions and life. One of the strongest temptations that beset a student upon entering his college life is to suppress the religious feelings and activities with which he was engaged at his home. This is the case especially where all attendance upon religious duties is purely voluntary. This fact, to be sure, does not by any means indicate an absolute loss, for whatever religious activity is displayed under such circumstances is more sure to be genuine and sincere. Probably no one feature of the religious life of our students stands out more clearly than its freedom from pretence, its downright genuineness.

The next most characteristic feature of this life has been its breadth and catholicity. In an institution where all sects and creeds are equally recognized, or rather where no sect or creed as such receives recognition, and young people of all faiths or of none meet in daily contact, it stands to reason that the spirit of bigotry and sectarianism is not likely to find much

favor. This does not argue any prevalence of that easy kind of tolerance that so readily degenerates into indifferentism, but rather of a wholesome respect for the opinions of others coupled with a firm grasp upon the validity of one's own views.

The University as the ward of a Christian Commonwealth has always been Christian in its character. Religion has been recognized officially in the holding of daily prayers, usually conducted by the President, attendance upon which has been voluntary since 1871, in special religious services held in connection with various public occasions, and in addresses upon religious themes which have been given to the students by members of the Faculties.

The atmosphere of the University has always been friendly to the nurture of religious life so far as it has been created by the influence and life of those who have been charged with the work of instruction, the larger number of whom have been in active sympathy and co-operation with the various branches of the Christian church.

But, undoubtedly, the most active and potent religious influence in the University has emanated from the organization known as the Students' Christian Association. This society recently celebrated the thirty-fifth anniversary of its founding, and is now acknowledged to be the oldest association of its kind in this country. Its history, interesting and instructive as it is, cannot be told at this time in detail. We can only glance at its most salient points. The Students' Christian Association has passed through three important stages. The beginning of its life is chiefly the work of a company of earnest and devoted young men who were graduated from 1858 to 1861. It is impossible in this sketch to single out the names of those who were most active and zealous in this work. Many of these

noble spirits took part in the civil war and laid down their lives for their country. The Association started on its career under the most prevalent and thorough religious awakening that has ever come to bless the life of the University, an awakening that was born of the general revival that swept over all our land in 1857 and 1858.

It was about 1872 that the Association took on a more formal organic life. Its influence now reached farther than before. With the advent of women it gained a new force. It took charge of all religious work in the University, organized prayer-meetings, instituted Bible classes, and sought to develop the missionary spirit and interest in the work of the ministry by organizing "Mission" and "Ministerial Bands." The library of religious reading, which was originally collected through the efforts of President Tappan and Dr. C. L. Ford for the use of all students, passed under the immediate control of the Association, and was increased by large donations from publishing houses.

The religious life of the student community was considerably stirred by a spiritual awakening which occurred in the winter of 1875. Since that time the only general revival of religious interest that has been inherent among us came as the result of a series of meetings held by the well-known evangelist, Dwight L. Moody.

Meanwhile the Christian Association has enlarged the scope of its activities. This has been made possible by the occupancy of its new and beautiful home, Newberry Hall, which was dedicated two years ago. A more systematic study of the Bible has been organized, and opportunities for wider influence have been eagerly improved. The Association has increased its usefulness by conducting mission schools in and about the

city, by holding religious services in the hospitals, and by assisting newly arrived students in finding desirable quarters for residence. With all the good work thus accomplished by this religious body, it still remains true that for some reason the interest and sympathy of the student community as a whole have not been enlisted in this association and its objects to the extent that might be expected. That this is partly due to the exclusiveness of the organization, resulting from the so-called "Portland test" of membership, which shuts out from full participation all who are not already members of evangelical churches, can hardly be doubted. With the recent return to the original basis of membership on which all students who desire to lead a Christian life may enter into full membership, it is hoped and believed that the Association will commend itself more largely to the interest and sympathy of the entire student community.

An interesting phase of the religious life of the University is likely to show itself, and indeed has already begun to appear in connection with the establishing of religious guilds under the auspices of several of the religious denominations represented in the city. The Hobart Guild of the Episcopal Church, the Tappan Guild of the Presbyterian Church, the Wesleyan Guild of the Methodist Church, and the Foley Guild of the Roman Catholic Church are, each in its way, trying to shape and direct the religious and social life of the students. Just what the outcome of this movement is to be, it is yet too early to predict. In connection with one or two of these guilds it is the purpose to establish at once chairs of theological instruction in order to train students for the ministry. In two of the guilds regular courses of lectures have been founded, of a semi-popular character, on the history of the church,

the evidences of Christianity, church institutions, and kindred themes.

That the organization of schools of theology in this centre of intellectual life is sure to affect directly and powerfully the thought and life of the entire student community needs no argument.

It is the prayerful desire of every thoughtful mind that knows anything about the multiform and keen intellectual life of this institution of learning, that this life should become more and more ennobled and consecrated by the purpose to serve God and man in the best possible way. That so many of this University's sons and daughters are to be found to-day in foreign fields as well as at home, serving the Master and trying to lift up and bless the children of ignorance and superstition, is a cause of devout gratitude ; may their numbers be multiplied.

The religious life of the University owes not a little of its strength to the sympathy and encouragement of the pastors and friends of the local churches. It is becoming better understood that no body of religious people can afford to ignore or to shut out of its sympathy this great centre of intellectual and spiritual power. What the character of this power shall be, whether for good or ill, rests to some extent at least with the Christian people of this State and of the churches of our land. It is their privilege to help make this University more and more a power for truth and God in the world.

MARTIN L. D'OOGHE.

I.

HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.



CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS JUDGED BY THEIR FRUITS.

PRESIDENT JAMES B. ANGELL.

Delivered May 15th, 1892.

According to the teachings of the gospel of Christ, men, governments, religions, all institutions are like trees to be known by their fruits. We all agree that this is a just principle of judgment. If it does not bear good fruits, then no matter what authority is claimed for it, no matter how hoary with age are its institutions, no matter with what learning and eloquence it is defended, no matter how many millions of adherents it can boast, it must be and will be weighed in the balance and found wanting.

This standard, by which Christianity consents to be judged, it also applies in judging every other system of religion. There are not a few persons who, observing how different religions have sprung up in different countries, have called attention to some useful features of each and have attempted to persuade us that each is especially adapted to meet the wants of some nation and is better suited to their needs than any other religion, than even Christianity itself. Of course, it follows as a consequence, if their main position is right, that it is obtrusive, impertinent, and even harmful for the disciples of Christ to go everywhere preaching the gospel, and offering a lesser for a greater good. But Christianity claims to be a religion for all men, the best religion for all nations, better for the Arabs and

Turks than Mohammedanism, better for the Hindus than Brahmanism or Buddhism, better for the Chinese than Confucianism or Taoism, better for the Japanese than Shintoism, better for all men than any other or all other faiths, because it reveals to us more clearly than any other the will of God concerning man, and so makes better men and better institutions. It does not ignore whatever is good or true in them. It furnishes that and something more, and so by a natural process supersedes them. As the morning sun with its floods of light drowns and quenches not only the misleading will-o'-the-wisps but also the very stars of night, so Christianity, if once received, supplants all other faiths and they vanish from our sight.

In spite of the intimations or statements of some modern writers that after all there is not so much to choose between the chief religions of the world, since each has certain merits and meets some deep wants of believers in it, I do not see how an impartial man can observe the fruits borne by non-Christian systems and those borne by Christianity without recognizing the immense superiority of Christianity as an actual working force among men.

I admit the difficulty of determining with precision exactly what results in a human life or in the life of a nation are due to religion. Life is complex. The factors which shape it are many. We cannot always measure the power of each factor. Still there are some results which are plainly due in a part to the religious beliefs of a man or a people. As we study the life of a nation, we can mark certain characteristic traits and tendencies, of which we can say with certainty that they are not due to race or climate or to anything but the religious belief of the nation.

Having been during my visit to Asia compelled to see the

operation of certain non-Christian systems, I have often been constrained to ask myself, "What fruits are lacking to them which Christianity yields?" Let me mention some of the answers which plain facts seem to suggest.

Now partly because some objectors to the superiority of Christianity set little or no store by what we may call the distinctly spiritual results of Christianity and partly to leave the case as strong as justice requires for the non-Christian religions, I will omit the consideration of what we call the spiritual results of Christian faith and contemplate only some of those ethical, social and intellectual results of Christianity which mark its superiority to all other faiths. These are the kinds of results whose value none can question.

1. In the first place I think that Christianity has succeeded in strengthening beyond all other religions the fundamental virtue of truthfulness. No doubt the ethics of the Asiatic religions are higher than those of any other non-Christian system. But it is the universal testimony of travellers that veracity is appreciated nowhere in Asia as it is in Northern Europe and in this country. Other virtues are set above it, as for instance in India kindness to animals; and in China filial respect. Lying is there a venial sin. To resort to it to escape from slight embarrassments surprises nobody.

Now with us, while there are unhappily too many men who do not always tell the truth, yet I think all regard truthfulness as the keystone of character. In the absence of this virtue we do not confidently look for any other. Experienced teachers will tell you that they cherish hopes of saving a wayward youth provided that he does not lie. But if he is a liar, there is nothing to build character on. The scripture thunders out its most terrible denunciations against lying and liars. It

withers and scorches the liar to a crisp in the blazing fires of its rebuke. Public opinion here brands a liar with unspeakable scorn and ineffable contempt. No man can retain the respect of decent men if his word is not good. Wherever Christianity is the purest and has the strongest hold on men, there the standard of truthfulness is highest and most rigorously respected. We so instinctively regard truthfulness as an essential of Christian character that we immediately pronounce any man or any nation, that lacks this virtue, unchristian. To have emphasized, developed and strengthened the virtue of veracity, this fundamental virtue, is not the least of the achievements of Christianity.

2. Again the attention of the traveller is strikingly arrested by the surprising contrast in the position accorded to women in Christian and non-Christian countries. Often as I contemplated the wretched lot of women in Asia, did the pathetic words in which Goethe makes Iphigenia pour forth her pathetic plaint, spring to my lips. "*Der Frauen Zustand ist beklagenswerth.*" "The condition of women is lamentable." Those words might be chiselled as an appropriate inscription on the gates of the cities and on the doorposts of the houses. So indeed it is in all the eastern world at present. Woman is doomed to ignorance. Her life has no width of horizon. She is the slave and the drudge of man. Her mind is not deemed worthy of education. I know of nothing in all the east so painful to the view of men from a Christian land as the condition of woman.

It is only where the gospel has shed its light, that woman is recognized as the companion of man, with faculties susceptible and deserving of as careful training as his, with a soul touched to finer issues than his, with duties, if in some respects different,

yet every whit as important and as responsible as his, because her primal duty and responsibility to God are the same as his. From the time when our Lord showed such delicate and beautiful courtesies to the sisters in Bethany, down through the days of Christian knighthood and quite to our own era, there has been in all Christendom a certain chivalric respect for woman which has never been witnessed anywhere outside of Christendom, and which has brought the highest blessings on men as well as on women, and has advanced and enriched and exalted all our civilization. This is distinctly a fruitage of Christian growth.

3. The traveller in non-Christian lands is struck with the lack of those great organized charities, whether private or public, which are found so abundantly in all Christian lands. These are wanting, not because there is no need of them. The poor and the suffering are everywhere. Beggars line the streets, crowd the gates of temples and cities, swarm upon your path. The blind, the deaf, the insane, the diseased are unhappily to be found in all lands. Nor are kind hearts wanting altogether in any land. But nowhere else has the duty of making large and careful provision for the needy been so clearly recognized as in the countries where the parable of the good Samaritan has been preached. Homes for orphans, asylums for the blind, for deaf mutes, for the insane, thoroughly appointed hospitals for the sick, nay, even humanely conducted prisons for the criminals, these all are the outgrowth of Christianity. The prisons of Asia are an abomination and disgrace to the race. Dante's *Inferno* with its fearful scenes hardly surpasses in horror some of those hells upon earth. It is only where Christianity has taken root that proper ideas of the punishment of the guilty are combined with a proper regard for the humanity which is found even in the most hardened criminals.

And surely it is Christianity alone which has led large-hearted and skilful physicians to go to heathen lands to establish hospitals for the gratuitous aid of the needy. When did Brahmanism or Buddhism or Confucianism set on foot such an undertaking? So strange is the idea to the Asiatic nations that they cannot comprehend the thought that good men and women have come to help them, out of utterly unselfish and humane motives. Such is the distance between Christianity and the eastern systems of religion.

4. The most superficial observer must be struck with the fact that in non-Christian states government, as a rule, takes on the type of absolutism. The state or the emperor is every thing, the individual nothing. Even in the ancient Greek and Roman republics this was largely true. The theory underlying them was that the individual existed for the state, not the state for the individual. The majority or the dominant faction spoke for the state, and the minority had few rights clearly recognized. Consequently the very best men were often ostracized or slain. There can hardly be said to be any individualism in Asiatic life. In certain cases there are strata of society. But in each stratum men rarely emerge above the dead level. Absolutism sits on its throne, tyrannical and often unjust. It is so arbitrary that no western nation consents to submit its citizens to the oriental courts. We have by treaty secured the right to establish our courts for trying our own citizens in all these lands.

It is too often forgotten that Christianity planted the germ of individual liberty in Europe by showing what is the worth of the human soul and by declaring that it has certain indefeasible rights of which not even the state can deprive it. When Peter and his associates declared to the astonished high priests,

“We must obey God rather than men,” they proclaimed that true higher law doctrine, which has come sounding down through the centuries, setting bounds to absolutism, and nerv- ing brave hearts everywhere to the assertion of their funda- mental rights and duties. Christianity has come to reverse or at any rate to modify the old doctrine, and to declare in sub- stance that the individual is not made for the state so much as the state for the individual, that men are not made for institu- tions, but all institutions, ordinances, sabbaths, churches, gov- ernments are here for the protection, elevation and salvation of individual men. When an institution utterly fails in this, be it church or government, it should give place to something better. The New Testament is the great charter of the rights of the human soul. Whatever improper restrictions are put upon human freedom in one or two nominally Christian lands, it is unquestionably true that civil liberty is most secure where the gospel doctrine of human rights is most clearly and fully recognized.

5. The traveller and the scholar have not failed to notice that non-Christian nations, even the most civilized, have never wrought out any well defined system of international law to govern their intercourse with each other. This is not an acci- dent. There was, of course, some personal exchange of civili- ties between sovereigns. But in general a foreigner was an enemy. In the Greek a foreigner was a barbarian. There was no word in either tongue to express the modern idea of neutrality between belligerents. The fundamental notion of international law, that nations are equal in respect to rights, is a distinctively Christian idea, a corollary from the doctrine of Christian brotherhood proclaimed by St. Paul in his great dis- course on Mars Hill, when he announced to the Greeks that

God "hath made of one blood all the nations of men," that is, they are children of one common Father, and so brethren. The Asiatic idea has been that nations live in isolation unless one is subject to another. For a long time China was unwilling to negotiate with western powers save as a superior with inferiors. The narrow conceptions of all Asiatic religions failed to grasp the idea of the brotherhood of man and the equal rights of nations, which is the very soul of modern international law. The whole system rests avowedly on the just and humane principle of Christian ethics, and it is possible thus far for Oriental nations to be admitted only partially to reciprocity under its code, because they have not fully accepted those ideas of justice, which Christianity has wrought into our system of jurisprudence.

6. The attitude of Christianity toward truth in general is more friendly and just than that of other religions. I do not forget how far short of the true catholicity of pure Christianity many of its professed disciples have come. Christianity itself is hospitable to truth from whatever source. Its supreme aim is truth. One of its chosen titles of its great Master, is The Truth. I know full well that many of its disciples have not been quick to give a welcome to new truth. Sometimes they have persecuted the messengers of truth. Sometimes they have been indifferent or hostile to the messages of truth, scientific, political or religious. Often this opposition has been due to the ignorance of men, who sincerely believed they were defending the truth, as Saul thought he was doing God service by haling Christians to prison. But after making all the concessions which are demanded on this score, it still remains indisputable that whether we consider the doctrines themselves or the believers in them, no religion can be for a moment compared with the

Christian faith for its promotion and dissemination of all kinds of truth.

In some lands learning is the exclusive possession of the priests, and by a natural impulse they shut their eyes to all learning which they do not originate or which cannot be made subservient to their special purposes. In others the believers are taught that their religious books contain all that is needful for man to know, and so all new truth is rejected as superfluous or obtrusive.

With the single exception of a few Brahmins, who have made some study of the religion of their English conquerors, it is the Christian disciple alone, who has made a careful philosophic study of all religions and sought with impartiality to recognize the good in each. It is from the bosom of Christian civilization with its great schools of learning, that nearly all scientific discovery has come. A very large proportion of the scientific investigators and discoverers, the Keplers and Newtons and Faradays abroad, the Peirces and Danas and Grays at home, have been most devout and reverent Christian men. The services to scholarship, to scientific learning, to the general increase of the treasures of the human mind, which have been rendered by all the civilizations that are dominated by non-Christian religions fall immeasurably short of the contributions of Christian civilization, although only about one-fourth of the human race are even nominally Christian.

Now I have stated, and have stated, I think, with moderation, some of the advantages which Christianity as a practical, working religion presents over other religions. I have not spoken at all of its distinctively spiritual superiority, of the high and rational hopes and aspirations, which it kindles in the soul by its revelation of a personal God and of our personal rela-

tions to Him, by its scheme of redemption from sin through Jesus Christ, by the "power of an endless life" which it sets up in the soul. What zeal for righteousness it has thus kindled in noble hearts, what patience under suffering it has generated in weak souls, whose trials, whose victories, and whose names are unknown to us! What crucifixions for the love of others it has enabled men to endure with songs on their lips, what errands of mercy for mankind has it sent saints upon, how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of its messengers as they publish their glad tidings to-day over all the world, what heroism, what self-sacrifice, what unselfish devotion to the right it has stimulated throughout Christendom!

But all these rich spiritual fruits of Christianity I pass by for the present, though I do not see how any but the most determined agnostic, who denies the possibility of knowing anything of God or of the future life, can fail to perceive how far higher are the inspirations of Christian revelation than those of the sensual paradise of Mohammedanism or those of the abstruse metaphysics or crude absurdities of the Hindu faiths. I have confined myself to some of the purely ethical, social, political and intellectual gains which it has brought to the race.

A religion which, beyond all others, fosters the fundamental virtue of truthfulness, which places woman in her true position, which fills the world with the blessed fruits of public and private charities, which has planted the germs of civil liberty by recognizing the worth of the individual and his true relation to the State, which has largely substituted for war the regulating power of Christian ethics in determining the relations of nations, and which recognizing God as the author of all truth and the creator and governor of all things in the universe, stimulates the reverent and ardent search for all truth in the confi-

dent faith that there is no breach or schism in the kingdom of truth,—a religion, which in these respects is clearly far superior to any or all others, is certainly not to be classed with them as one of several religions equally good, or as a local or a race religion, good for the west, but not better than Buddhism or Confucianism for the east.

Its stamp of superiority is in its work, in its whole history, in its present triumphs, in its great tendencies, in the prophecies of good to all mankind, with which its life is eloquent. It is in the study of its essential character, in the contemplation of what it has actually done, that we read no less clearly than in the promises of Scripture, the prediction of its ultimate triumph over the whole earth. Its progress may seem to us slow. But all history, sacred and profane, shows us that the human race moves and has always moved forward at a rate which seems to our impatience slow. It is entirely probable that in some respects Christianity will take on a different coloring in different parts of the world. But that in some form, in which its fundamental characteristics are retained, it must at last supersede the inferior religions of the world, no one can doubt who believes that ultimately the highest and best truth, the truth which is most beneficent to man, will by its inherent force prevail throughout the world. We may well hope that while unchanged in its essential traits, it may, when interpreted by the various temperaments and experiences of oriental and African peoples, take on a richness and depth and beauty and fulness of significance to which we are now strangers. The world will then at once have discovered and demonstrated that Christianity is not merely a religion, but the religion, not a Judean or Galilean sect, not merely a western religion, but the one universal religion, including all that is good and rejecting

all that is bad in all other religions, the one and only best faith for all kingdoms and states. Then shall be fulfilled the prediction of our Lord, that there shall be one flock made up of many folds, and there shall be one shepherd blessed for ever.

PRIMITIVE AND MODERN CHRISTIANITY.

PROF. FRANCIS W. KELSEY.

Delivered May 8, 1892.

Christianity is no experiment. For more than eighteen centuries it has been tested by the demands arising from every phase of human experience. It has witnessed the passing of over fifty generations of men. It has outlived the civilization, the political, social and moral conditions in which it originated. It has survived the destruction of states and institutions with whose life its own existence seemed inseparably connected. Yet to-day its influence is more widely extended and more potent in the world than in any previous time. It is well to turn for a few moments from the present outlook, to see what were the beginnings of that which has become so important a factor in human progress.

To all appearances, Christianity at the start was doomed to immediate and irretrievable extinction. Its founder avoided centres of political authority, and sought to gain no influence as a diplomat. He gathered no army to enforce his claims, but taught his followers to be long-suffering under oppression. He founded no school of philosophy, whose members would cherish and proclaim his teachings. He left no writings that might be referred to in the future as an authentic statement of his doctrine. He did not even select a body of trained minds to interpret and transmit his message; the men he chose were for the most part unlettered. After only three years of labors, that

to most of his contemporaries seemed folly and failure, he was seized and executed, suffering the most ignominious death known to the times. His defenceless followers, without organization, without full comprehension of their master's work and purposes, were dismayed at the fact and manner of his death. Thus Christianity had its origin in a career and amid circumstances to which history presents no parallel, which seemed utterly inconsistent with all conditions of success.

Hardly less remarkable was the early and rapid extension of Christianity. No powerful princes espoused its claims and promoted its interests. No richly endowed theological seminaries sent forth each year their eager throngs of earnest and trained preachers. No Bible societies scattered copies of the sacred documents wherever men would read them. No ponderous volumes of theological lore summed up for the inquirer the results of the investigations and reflections of the most learned men. Simply from mouth to mouth the word was passed. One believer told another the story of the Christ and the new life. Slaves, peasants, soldiers, traders transmitted the message to their fellows. Men and women of higher rank became interested. Within a hundred years after the crucifixion of Jesus as a malefactor, Christianity was known and professed in all parts of the Roman empire, and had counted among its adherents at least a few who stood near the throne of Rome.

And this progress was not without opposition. For three centuries the rising church was in the midst of constant and deadly conflict. Whatever the indebtedness of Christianity to Judaism at the beginning, short time passed before Judaism joined hands with paganism to crush it out. Nor was the strife with paganism simply a war of creeds. Paganism was

incarnate in the authority of Rome. The bureaucratic, absolute administration of the Roman empire, like that of Russia to-day, found its only safety in crushing out all organizations not directly under governmental supervision. The strictest laws forbade associations of people except for certain clearly defined purposes. Christ left no manual of church government; but the association of the faithful in groups and bodies was an immediate result of his teachings regarding brotherhood and his institution of the sacrament of the holy communion. So soon as the church began to organize, it came into collision with the laws of Rome. It was persecuted on political grounds, as a matter of public policy. A legal basis for persecution was never lacking. Heedless or bad emperors, to whom the condition of the empire was a matter of small concern, might pass the Christians by; but good emperors, as Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, who wished to govern for the best interests of the state, could not, consistently with imperial traditions and policy, do otherwise than endeavor to obliterate that new religion which admitted no amalgamation or compromise with the creeds recognized by the state authorities, and whose fundamental tendencies caused it to be at variance with established laws. Yet whether in peace or in persecution, the church increased everywhere in numbers and influence. At the beginning of the fourth century, while Judaism had indeed lost ground, paganism had so far declined that Christianity soon replaced it as the state religion.

It is clear that in the progress of Christianity in the early time we discover the manifestation or operation of a force. The analogy of that force is to be found, not in physical or chemical, but in biological, science. For the force which manifests itself through Christianity has the characteristics of vitality.

It began at once to clothe itself with an organism—the church. This organism underwent a process of differentiation in adjusting itself to its environment, The interaction between the organism and its environment affected both. In all that is outward, in government and in ritual, the branches of the Christian church to-day represent the result of centuries of action and reaction between the inner force and the world without. Who will say that in all that is exterior the Christianity of to-day is not an illustration of the principle of evolution?

Systems of theology, no less than the institutions of the church, attest the same development. Theologies are the philosophic treatises, creeds are the text-books, or primers, which deal with the force and its manifestations. Just as scientific treatises vary from generation to generation, according to point of view or correctness of method or range of facts; just as in this field each generation tests the work of the preceding and makes its own contribution, so, in the history of the literature of Christianity from the days of Justin and Minucius Felix, the statement of all except fundamental principles has undergone constant revision, the imperfect explanation or interpretation of one epoch being corrected by the following. The needs of the race vary with every age. Even old truths must be restated, in the forms most appropriate to the environment. Who will declare that the last word has yet been said in physics or chemistry or biology? Who will say that these sciences do not involve mystery as impenetrable to human ken as the mysteries of our faith, or that a final statement in this stage of being will be possible? Then in view of the mystery and the vast range of data comprised in that manifestation which we call Christianity, we may well doubt whether a final and all-comprehensive statement will ever be made by man.

This development, or evolution, of Christianity, suggested by the contrast between primitive and modern forms, is no meaningless accident. It is a fact fraught with the highest significance for the church and for the world. No fact more clearly shows forth the divine origin of Christianity, or points out its mission as the world-religion. The history of the church as a whole is an illustration of the law of the survival of the fittest. Christianity has shown a constant tendency to take the place of inferior beliefs. In its own inner life there has been a marked tendency to pass from lower to higher forms. When it has become encrusted with elements alien to its own nature, it has burst its bonds and freed itself from the trammels of formalism and corruption. That vitality manifest in the beginning still pervades the church. Will anyone say that God is not imminent in it, working through it the accomplishment of his far-reaching plans?

Amid all the shifting and changing of the Christian centuries, in all the interaction between Christianity and its environment, one element has remained constant, unchanging, essential. Christianity was not primarily a system of government, a ritual, or a theology; it was a life. It was the individual life for which Jesus died. It was the sin, the sorrow, the hopelessness of an existence without a future beyond the grave that He came to succor. It was the joyousness of a life redeemed that spread the message of good tidings throughout the Roman Empire; the half-hearted priests of paganism, the hostile Jews, even the authorities of Rome herself were powerless to stay its course. It was the humility of a devout life, the courage of a faithful life, the self-sacrifice of a consecrated life, the purity of a sanctified life, that amazed and angered the corrupt pagan world.

No pen or pencil can portray the trials of the Christian in those days. Men were tested as by fire. Occupations and professions, business forms and social usages, were all interwoven with pagan traditions and interpenetrated with religious observances abhorrent to the follower of Jesus. Acceptance of Christianity drove a sharp line of cleavage between the converted heathen and all he held dear. The battle for him was not for a day or a month, but for years, for life. When persecution came, unless he paid worship to the Emperor's image or that of some other divinity, he was treated as a criminal, subject to the most awful tortures or to death. Yet so terrible the strain of the Christian life that many an one sought the martyr's crown, that he might be the sooner with his Lord. Harder to bear even than physical suffering was the atmosphere of scandal and ridicule about the early church. Men reported, and believed, that the Christians worshipped the head of an ass; that a part of the ceremony of initiation consisted in plunging a poignard into the flesh of a young child, and sucking its blood; and that a part of the celebration of the Lord's supper was only a cover for the most fearful orgies and unrestrained debauchery. Persecution and slander only winnowed the church. Then, as now, there were excrescences of Christian character. Then, as now, some emphasized one virtue or one trait more than others, and made it prominent. But whatever may be said in regard to development in other elements of Christianity, the type and the ideal of the life of the follower of Jesus have undergone no changes. The same simplicity, consecration, fervor, self-forgetfulness and unswerving faith which the world regards as truly Christian to-day, have been so regarded from the beginning.

If this be true, do we not see in the Christian character

that which is fundamental and essential, the germ and center of Christianity? Church government and forms of worship and systems of theology are a part of the necessary adjustment of Christianity to the world; but only in the salvation of the individual soul do we find its true purpose, and witness the manifestation of its highest power. Other religions have been adjusted only to a limited environment. They have met, though only in part, the aspirations of a single race or a single nation or of a series of tribes or peoples, similarly conditioned. Other religions have shown themselves incapable of passing the ethnic or geographical bounds within which they originated, and have failed either to attract or to convert the world. Christianity alone is truly catholic, circumscribed in its capability of adjustment to human conditions by no limitations of race or time or physical boundaries. The message that the early Christians transmitted slowly along the great Roman roads is the same as that which to-day speeds over the world with the aid of steam and electricity. The zeal of those days in the spread of the gospel finds a fitting complement in the missionary activity of the present age.

Why Christianity has appealed to the individual life, and through it has influenced the world, is not far to seek. It completely meets the needs of man's religious nature. It offers redemption from sin, which he has found nowhere else. It sets before him moral perfection as an ideal, and presents a perfect life as model. It stimulates the intellectual life: 'Prove all things,' it says, 'hold fast to that which is good.' It enjoins the care of the body as 'the temple of the Holy Ghost.' Even the appreciation of the beautiful in our earthly life received the sanction of Christ; who can read what He said of the lilies of the field and not feel that for all time He has bidden men

look toward the ideal of beauty as well as of holiness? But above all, to the struggling, sorrowing soul there comes to-day, as in the earliest days, that message of present help and encouragement, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' So long as weak, erring, perplexed human nature remains the same, so long will Christianity continue to minister to it as no other religion ever has done; and the faith of Jesus can never be superseded, for in its essentials it is perfect and enjoins perfection.

What word, then, does the primitive church send across the ages to the present hour? It bids us rejoice that we are born in a period and land free from the fiery trials of faith through which it passed. It bids us see clearly the distinction between germinal and historical Christianity, between the religion of Jesus as a vital principle and its embodiment in institutions which, though a necessary result of innate tendencies brought into relation with an environment, are nevertheless not the essential things. It bids us first of all "Seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness;" and then, with the calm trust and confidence of a soul conscious of its redemption, to live the Christ-life day by day. It bids us convey to others, near and far, the tidings of great joy. Finally it bids us join with the redeemed of all ages in the hope and prophecy,—

"Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
Does his successive journeys run,
His Kingdom spread from shore to shore,
Till moons shall wax and wane no more."

THE FORCE OF CHRISTIANITY IN UNITED STATES HISTORY.

*"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John VIII—32;
also Acts XVII—26.*

PROF. ANDREW C. MC LAUGHLIN.

Delivered April 10, 1892.

Force and Christianity seem antithetical. Of Christianity we predicate gentleness, love, and peace. Humility and modesty, rather than energy, may be said to be the attributes of the followers of the Son of Man. But such an antithesis is only apparent. Christianity may be partially defined in a great many ways, but however you attempt to describe it, its place is in the field of dynamics and not of statics. Christianity is true life, is movement, is the unfolding by action of the perfect truth of God. Christ came to lead us to the truth. His teachings are the touch-stone of truth. A nation is feeling the force of Christ or exhibiting the force of Christianity as it struggles to a fuller realization of truth in its national life.

Does Christianity show itself in the forces of history? History is popularly supposed to consist of a succession of battles, or the rise or fall of dynasties, or at best the growth of institutions through the influence of individual men, or perchance through apparent accident. Unless the church, as the

instrument of God, has directly shaped a political movement, or a man imbued with Christian doctrine has preached the living truth and influenced the founders of states, or unless there has been some direct and evident manifestation of God's power, we conceive the state as a heathen thing, coming into being and moving its way along unaided or unguided by the life-giving breath of God. We are ready to study most profoundly the wonderful conversion of Constantine, and are willing to accept the cross in the heavens as a God-given miracle. Even if it were subjective entirely, we fain would see God coming from His throne to change the life of the Roman Empire, by turning the mind of its Cæsar to a contemplation of the verities of Christianity. In accord with such a conception of history, the Maker and Ruler of the universe, for three hundred years and more after the birth of Christ, sat upon His distant Olympus and watched the different races of warring men, His curiosity piqued perhaps, to see how all would result.

We are willing also, as students of God's work in the world, to study eagerly the introduction of the Church into ancient England. We trace the work of Augustine with rigid care. Each new advance of the priests from kingdom to kingdom we note with great exactness, as if we were seeing the advance of God into regions which before he had not known. I would not underestimate the beatific influence of the Church in old distraught, chaotic England. My contention is simply for a fuller recognition of God's presence in the world, and I would maintain that He was not wholly absent or unconcerned when the semi-barbarous, wholly-heathen, brutal Englishman came from the forests of Germany, swept the remnants of Roman power into the sea, and scattered the sluggish, forceless Christian British into mountain fastnesses of the island. God

was not absent when that heathen wedge was inserted into the Christian Roman Empire. For the Christianity was devoid of vigor. Not every one that cries, Lord! Lord! is a forceful child of God. The heathen nation was alive, physically strong, mentally alert, and imbued with a certain feeling of rugged independence and of sturdy individuality, qualities that were never to be lost, but to withstand the vicissitudes and trials of the passing centuries, to show themselves refined and disciplined in institutions of government whereby the individual might more fully realize himself and perfect himself as a member of the whole. The heathenism itself contained strong elements which were of great service in the progress of Christian civilization. "In the old Gothic religion were embodied principles and . . . morals that in due course of time and under favorable circumstances evolved the Republic of Ireland, the Magna Charta of England, and the Declaration of Independence." (1)

I shall be obliged at the very outset to insist upon this conception of history. There is method in the seeming madness, in the hurly-burly of succeeding events in history. There is progress through the centuries toward a completer development of man, toward a completer realization of himself, toward completer freedom. The wandering savage who is a bond-slave to the forces of nature, becomes their master as society becomes more complicated and as each man more fully expresses himself in the highly organized state. As the centuries go by, man becomes a higher being; for an increase of duties means an increase of functions. As a social being, by a thousand tender tentacles, he holds fast to his fellows and gives them aid, and is nourished in turn again. It is impossible to conceive of him

(1)Anderson's Norse Mythology, p. 129.

save in his relations. We watch the multiplication and strengthening of these relative ties, and we know that this is the process of history—the transformation of nomadic man into the highly developed social being of the twentieth century. It is a fundamental conception—and I shall endeavor to show its application in America—that man has been increasing in a fuller realization of himself, and freedom has been increasing in depth and meaning. In the perfect state we shall have perfect freedom, for there we shall have perfect love and a perfect arrangement of society. Man has not lost his individuality but is gaining it. He becomes more of a man and a higher man when he can perform more duties. The law of perfect love, which is perfect self-sacrifice, is not self-stultification or self-destruction, but the building up—the edification of self into a higher and nobler companion to man and child of God.

There are many who would deny that the scientific study of history is possible. Political science is deemed a pleasing figure of speech. The scoffer would study with diligence the gregarious habits of the chimpanzee, and wonder at the artful works of a colony of ants or beavers. Generalization would follow generalization, and a pretty piece of inductive science be the result. But man, he says, has free will; he is bound by no law; he is more and more an independent and self-determining being. Now nothing could be more false than this. Free agency is a wofully over-burdened phrase. The advancing ages have shown man less and less the subject of caprice. He daily moves in paths that may be traced. He is more and more the creature of law. We must not set God to work over a beaver dam or an ant-hill, and banish Him when a mighty state is rearing out of the chaos of savagery. A broad study of the events of history will show that different nations playing their

parts have their exits and their entrances in the world's great drama. Political science in its study of institutions, a study as yet in its infancy, has shown the force of great laws of development. The historian who looks deep into the events of the passing ages is not content with saying: "Thus Luther spake. Here Cromwell strove for victory." Luther was the embodiment of the spirit of the Reformation. Through Cromwell there surged that dominant spirit of free man that was working its will in the life of the English nation. What was Luther without reference to the past or the present? What was Cromwell if we blind our eyes to the forces of his century that were working through him to produce that delicately constituted English state government, where man is now working his way to greater and more glorious freedom? The spirit of the age,—what is it but the will of God manifesting itself through men as imperfect instruments of power?

The reign of law, then, is not confined to what we unjustly describe as nature. Unjustly, I say, for organized man, or men organized constitute a *natural* phenomenon. The state and its work are emphatically not artificial. There may be truth in the statement of James Wilson, that as man is the noblest work of God, so the state is the noblest work of man. But it is a precarious footing for judge or statesman. The blending of common impulses, of common sympathies and hopes is the broad basis of the state, and this is a natural and not an artificial process.

We see the force of God in nature in a thousand complex acts of the dumb creatures below us. We recognize the presence of a great force in nature, and as Christians we would not discriminate too carefully between the forces of nature and the will of God. Is man responsive to no extraneous impulse—

the proud possessor of free-will uninfluenced by the forces of nature? The study of biological sciences has emphasized in a hundred ways, the old statement, whose truth we never accept, that man is an animal. He may be made in the image of God, he may have within him a portion of the divine word which was in the beginning with God, but he is an animal, and has not thrown off all such characteristics and will not while he remains man. As an animal he is under the reign of law. More correctly—he acts in response to forces over which free-agency has only speculative control. And even in his higher work of state-building there is something of the same domination of instinct that we notice when a colony of beavers builds its marvelous dwellings and prepares its simple state.

The institutions of the Englishman have been especially studied and we can trace the evolutionary development in them with especial assurance. The growth of an English state has been steadily in response to a simple impulse of widening. Scattered here and there over the face of Germany we catch sight of little communities of self-governing men. They control their simple lives by simple regulations. Each centre of life, each bit of protoplasm is ready to give up a portion of its life-service to the whole while it remains an individual cell. By a process of assimilation these ganglionic centers unite in a larger whole and these again form a more complicated state. All the way, there is a retention of individual life and partial autonomy while the organization of the whole widens and deepens. This process is reproduced in Britain, when the English people leave their old homes by the Elbe for new ones by the Thames and Southampton Water. Four centuries are needed for this process of aggregation and agglomeration to produce unified England—retaining its protoplasmic life, its old

Germanic spirit. In America the same controlling laws of state-growth have operated from the beginning. When the fathers met at Philadelphia to perform that last great act of aggregation by bringing into a conjunctive whole the autonomous groups of people, they were not aware that their work was a step in development, a part of a natural process, that great forces of Aryan nation-building were making use of their so-called free-wills to bring about a great and glorious consummation in the widening of the state. I have spoken of the Philadelphia convention as the last great act. But what reason have we to think it will be the last? Why should there be a cessation of that process of extension. England and America can arbitrate. Canada and America can reciprocate. The day has come when one of the wisest and truest men in our public life stands ready to say that a war between England and the United States would be a step backward in civilization. Is the time at infinite distance when there will be another step in this process of aggregation?

So far I have been offering random suggestions of the work of God in history, maintaining that the great process of nation-building is a natural process under the impulses of God, and that man, though a free-agent, works in response to great natural forces, which in the brute creation we call instinct. I have declared that in the formation of the United States we saw one of the last great steps in the Teutonic process of aggregation. In discussing the work of God in history, I have some difficulty in differentiating it from the work of Him who was in the beginning with God. But we know that through revelation in Christ there will be and is a gradual unfolding of truth, as man works up to it, and we must expect to find it in time—in history. This unfolding of truth, this discovery,

more and more, of the relations of man to man and of man to God, is the working out of Christianity in history. When one, by action, fully realizes himself in his relations, he is doing his full duty. Even then there may be duty following duty as relations change, for Christian force is unfolding truth, and until all truth is known there is work for the forces of Christianity.

How have the great truths of God been especially revealed in the history of the United States? or, to put the question in another way, how has there been progress toward a full appreciation of conditions and relations? How has man come to be a truer and wiser actor in society? How has that society risen to higher and nobler life, widening in the process of the suns?

I have already suggested that the history of the United States began long before the discovery of America. The forces that were operating two thousand years ago and more have simply displayed their grander vigor in the last hundred years. As some one has said that modern history began with the calling of Abraham, so one may be fully justified in saying that the *Germania* of Tacitus is the first work on American history, Let us adopt, however, the conventional definition of American history.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century there were a number of settlements scattered along the Atlantic coast. Each was developing in response to the Anglo Saxon instinct. But each was leading its individual life. Contrariety and diversity were more noticeable than harmony. The life of each colony was largely shaped by the topography of the country; for man had not yet the skill or the opportunity to rise above his environment. The history of our colonial period, what was it? what does it mean? It can be studied along two lines, and

these two lines will eventually meet to form one. We see on one hand the growth of the spirit of self-assertion, of independence and self-government in the colony, on the other the drift toward union and aggregation. These endless, tiresome bickerings between the assemblies and the governors have their meaning. They indicate an effort to throw off the incubus of extraneous influence and domination. If the American people were to do their work in the world they needed to become self-determinate. Self-determination does not mean anarchy; it means freedom; by freedom is meant not lawlessness, but easy, pliable obedience to the forces of God in the world as they are revealed—their revelation is the expression of Christianity. *A nation is free which is in perfect accord with the will of God and has risen to such self-control, such freedom from the load of sin that it acts in the direction of its own highest good*—or, to repeat, is in full accord with the will and purposes of God. “And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” A nation is developing freedom which is casting off extraneous restraint and is learning to govern itself, is coming to that stage of self-control and self-restraint which is the condition precedent of freedom. A man is not free who is not able to put himself in line with the forces of nature and take advantage of her laws. Will a man boast of his freedom in such language as this: “I know nothing of electricity, of the laws of its expansion. I am unable to make use of it. I don’t understand how. I won’t learn how. I shall do as I want to. I am a free agent.” Would there not be more sense in this: “I am a free man because I have learned how to put myself in touch with the forces of nature; I have studied her laws; I can work with her; I find that she is ready to serve me if I know her speech and mind it.” Now any one who sees in

colonial history the evolution of anarchy and not of order—self-order—is a man who believes that democracy is chaos and not the coalition of individual atoms into a compact, consistent whole, in which, because of its structure, its *natural* structure, the forces of God have free-play—freer and freer as the democratic state is ever more naturally, harmoniously and reasonably constituted. With such a man I have not time to argue. He is the slave of a dead conception.

Our colonial life must be traced along lines of developing sympathy. Democracy without sympathy is a tinkling cymbal. The selfish colonist loses his particularistic tendencies. Patriotism is begotten within him. When the Boston Port bill is passed, the cavalier of Virginia and the puritan of Massachusetts have a common cause. The rough back-woodsman of western Pennsylvania sends over the mountains his wagon-load of flour to the poor of the beleaguered city. Such sympathy shows the heart-throbs of a new nation—a nation whose governing principle is and must be brotherly love, democracy ever growing into fuller and riper Christian fellowship.

When the American people entered upon their career as an independent nation this process of fusion was not complete. There was a nation, but it was in its infancy in every sense. More truly, the hold of state on state was still fragile, of man on man was feeble. Our history from July 4, 1776, as before that date, is a process of hardening and strengthening these ties—of deepening and broadening sympathy. For the first thirteen years after independence was declared the struggle was a sharp one. Would the forces of disintegration overcome the force of integration—would selfishness overcome Christian brotherhood? Out of and because of this struggle there rose a higher and better state. When the articles of Confederation

were adopted they included the historical falsehood that each state retained its sovereignty. But the force of the national life would not have it so. In speaking of American history we almost irresistably talk in terms of law. The legal controversies of a century have shaped our speech and even moulded our thought. But let us cast to one side the mere human forms whereby man tries to direct the forces of nature, and let us see the situation. Through that critical storm-and-stress period of our history the forces of dissolution and of integration were striving together. Disintegration, dissolution, death, constitute the fruits of sin. Christianity is brotherhood, is union, is a complete and full co-operation, is life and movement as the truth is unfolded and duty becomes more clear. The constitution was formed. Lawyers, historians, logicians, have striven and argued. Was it formed by the states? Was it formed by the people? Was it a mere confederation? Was it a fundamental law? Never mind. It was a fuller expression of the national will. The old confederation was a lie. It contracted the national spirit, till bonds were burst asunder and the truth was put in its place. There then came into existence adequate machinery for the expression of the national life—God-given.

The fiction of the lawyer is convenient. “All was decided by the constitution. There is the form of government. Thus must national life express itself.” But the struggle was only begun. Our history from 1789, as before, has been a process of adjustment. A hundred years have gone by, and in that hundred years there has been growth to compactness, to oneness, to wholeness. I am not talking of law. I am not attempting to form any theory about the place of deposit of certain sovereign powers or questioning how they should be

exercised. The past hundred years through stress and struggle have brought into existence a higher union and a fuller national life. Long our state was attacked by the disease which endangered its whole existence. If it could not throw it off, retrogression and dissolution were the logical results. In one mighty throe of agony, slavery was forever cast out. It left a scar on the body politic that only time can heal. But the victory was won. This was the momentous victory for Christianity and brotherhood in every sense—not that alone four millions of slaves were taken from the bondage of serfdom, but North and South were now to be welded together in firmer compact, to realize together the life which neither section could realize alone.

The teachings of the seventy-five years of struggle, which ended with the surrender of Appomattox, are important. A great and enlightened people insisted that by a line on a piece of parchment they were protected in keeping to themselves a sin which the modern world will not tolerate. The forces of Christendom were leveled against it. These forces of Christendom—these influences, some of them seemingly very material, which emanate from the states of the modern world—are they not the forces of Christianity expressing themselves in a thousand ways? Whence could they come had not the life of the state been shaping itself, unconsciously perhaps, in response to the great force of God? Modern Christendom will not tolerate commercial monasticism. The South was not allowed to say: "This taint is my own. I build up my own industrial life. I care not for the moral denunciation of the modern world or the cold shoulder of trade." But the cold shoulder of trade was powerful. The drift of modern civilization has not been toward the domination of man over man, but of man over

nature; and the South with slavery, that expression of ancient civilization where man's greatest aim was the conquest of man by man, was left hopelessly behind in the unfolding of modern life. In spite of herself she reached out for the conflict. She was vanquished, for she had been beaten before she began to fight. The organic life of the American nation would not and could not suffer the disorganization that sprang from secession.

Abraham Lincoln has been called the embodiment of true American greatness. He belongs with the great men of all time, with the world's great men, and why?—because of his mental acumen, his human sympathy, his Christian benevolence? All these and ten times more. He was a great man of all the ages, because through him flowed and became all-powerful the life of the modern world—because he of all men was chosen as the representative, the embodiment or—better perhaps—the channel for the floods of Christian force in statecraft. The great men of the world are not the men who struggle with Herculean power against the unrestrainable drift of life, no matter what their moral purpose, no matter what their mental vigor. When judged by history success is a prime requisite for greatness. “How necessary is success!” said Kossuth as he stood by the tomb of Washington. The great men of the world have been the channels of God's irresistible force in the work of evolution of a higher and better civilization. As we study the life and work of Lincoln we may especially see the forces of Christianity in United States history—union, sympathy, self-control, wisdom, good-fellowship, faith, hope, and charity. Abraham Lincoln was not an exotic.

So much for the process of unification which seems the first great process at work in American history. He who studies American history with a contrary conception will lose,

I believe, the key to its secrets. The second phase of American history, the growth of democracy, is intimately connected with the facts we have just considered. Separation and contrariety I conceive to be a difficulty for America beyond other States because we have more fully realized harmonious statehood in representative democracy. The old cry that democracies must fly to pieces sooner or later—how absurd! The perfect democracy will present a welded, indissoluble whole, natural and hence permanent.

Let us accept the assertion that man can develop not as an isolated being but as a member of the whole! As one of many, he does the work of Christ. Christ demands above all not alone the purification of the soul of man but the *action* which, in itself, constitutes love. “And this is love, that ye walk after his commandments.” (Second Epistle of John, 6.) The perfect law of Christ is the golden rule. One must love his neighbor as himself. Pure democracy is the embodiment of Christianity because the perfect law of democracy is the perfect law of Christ. Now, I do not wish to assert that we have reached that perfect democracy, where all will stand firm in the perfect freedom which springs from the law of Christ; but I do maintain that this force has been at work in our history. There have been contradiction and misconception, but the progress has been inevitable. Jefferson, the great father of American democracy, often taught individualism and disintegration. His teachings mean dissolution, not democracy. But the nation has sloughed off the falsity of Jefferson’s work and teaching and has built the truth into its life. For while he was teaching individualism he was also actually demanding scope for individuality. He was preaching the dignity of man. He was protesting against the law and the custom which would

subject the state to the domination of the few. He was teaching growth, free and natural progress, room for thought. Against the tightening bands of modern life which were ever forcing into a compacter whole the elements of the state, he could make little headway. But through Jefferson came the demand for wholesome, natural development of the parts. Individuality is not contrary to, but the mere obverse side of democracy. By working for a natural state, which would suffer the natural progress of man, he was demanding that our country put itself into harmony with the forces of God and the teachings of Christ.

In studying the history of the United States we are wont to limit ourselves to changes in its law. We are content with watching what we call its political life. But we ought not to forget that only a minute fraction of the life of a people is shown by its laws and its outward changes of government. The broad sweeping stream of society whirls on, making its own channels with little deference to the rigid sluice-ways of artificial law. In numberless ways the social life of the community finds expression without the aid of statute or constitution. A thorough study of American history would show in its fulness this onward surge of American life, and in it all we would see, I am sure, the forceful presence of Christianity. American materialism has an ugly sound, but it signifies in essence that the American man has been wresting her secrets from nature, that daily he is making her serve him, that he is coming to a mastery of his environment that will enable him to master himself; and in the complete freedom which comes from a mastery of self is the perfect liberty of Christ. American materialism means the continuous discovery of truth, and this is progressive Christianity. American materialism has unified and diver-

sified the national life and has given the greatest impetus yet seen in the history of the world toward that broad foundation for the unity of mankind which is the forerunner of the kingdom of God. The force of commerce is not of evil—if it is we are in the hand of Satan. Trade has opened the arteries of the continent and the life-blood of the nation sweeps from sea to sea. Trade has bound the nations together in a sympathetic life, which is Christian in its breadth. Compare it with the selfish life of the ancient world, and you will realize that humanity is engaged on a nobler field. The Jews may have no dealings with the Samaritans, but the intelligent Christian calls no man unclean.

The study of American history furnishes poor food for pessimism. The end of the nineteenth century sees a truer national life, a deeper sense of public justice, a more profound faith in man and his destiny under God. He who studies the life of the nation in its tottering infancy will not quail at the sight of the dangers which surround its manhood. Nothing is more evident to the student than the strength, the manliness, the tone of the American public. I do not close my eyes to abuses in office, to the presence of brazen-faced wrong in the marts of trade. But the steady throb of America's heart is sending through her veins a strong flood of pure live-giving blood. She will cast off the curse of ignorance and of vice that will endeavor to to throttle her, and will give ever freer expression to the common will and public conscience.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE ON THE GROWTH OF CHRISTIANITY.

PROF. JOHN C. ROLFE.

Delivered April 30, 1893.

At the period in which the life of the Savior falls, the entire civilized world, from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf, from the Rhine to the deserts of Africa, owned the sway of Rome. This circumstance in itself, the union of the nations under one head, with one official language, was favorable to the spread of the new faith; for there was but one government to contend with, and communication between remote parts of the earth was rendered easy.

But we have additional reason for congratulating ourselves, that the universal conqueror, to which the other nations had one after the other succumbed, was none other than Rome. What the result would have been if the various peoples of antiquity had been able to follow out their development in their own way, without coming into conflict with each other, can only be a matter of conjecture; but an examination of the records of history leads us to the conclusion that if it was inevitable that one nation should conquer and absorb the rest, we have reason to rejoice that the victory fell to a people who were able to make such good use of it.

The Greeks, with their eager desire for knowledge and love of the beautiful, may rouse our sympathies and win our hearts; but Greece never advanced beyond the idea of the

city as the unit of polity, and besides her great men showed their weakness and lack of self-control when in the possession of unrestrained power. Themistocles, Pausanias, and Alexander illustrate this national failing, and the speedy dismemberment of the great Macedonian's empire after the death of its founder, shows how unfitted the Greek was by nature for universal dominion. Even had it been possible for some one of the Greek cities to gain and to maintain supremacy over the rest of the world, we cannot feel that such a sovereignty would have benefited mankind. To judge by the conduct of Athens as head of the Confederacy of Delos, it would have meant the aggrandizement of the capital at the expense of the rest of the empire.

Very different was the policy of Rome; from the Tagus to Palmyra the remains of roads, bridges, aqueducts, theatres and temples testify to her efforts to bind together the heterogeneous elements of her empire, and to improve and advance her provinces.

Nor does the history of Rome's great rival across the Mediterranean lead us to wish that the result of Zama had been different, and that 'the sordid race of Tyre' had taken the place of the Romans as lords of the earth. Indeed, from the point of view of the best interests of mankind, there is no nation whose defeat and conquest by Rome should cause us regret; the very weaknesses which cut short the careers of her rivals made their success undesirable.

Not that the Romans were perfect; faults they had in abundance, but their national characteristics eminently fitted them for their great mission, to unite and closely bind together the nations under one head, and so prepare the way for the spread of the new faith.

Let us consider briefly the origin and early history of this great people, to determine, if possible, what its national characteristics were, and how they favored the perpetuation of the Christian religion.

The beginnings of Rome were small. The seven hills beside the Tiber appear to have been originally the rallying-place of the lowlanders against their highland neighbors, in that contest so often repeated in the history of the world. Surrounded from the first by hostile and powerful peoples, more advanced than itself in most lines of human activity, the little settlement seemed very unlikely to be the cradle of a mighty empire; but the very difficulties of the situation favored the future greatness of the race.

As we may infer from the legends of early Rome, which, though not history, have been made by modern research to throw much light on the prehistoric period, the seven hills were originally occupied by several different communities. This fact is an important one to bear in mind in tracing the development of the commonwealth; from its origin the Roman state consisted of an amalgamation of different communities, and the principle of association formed the foundation of its greatness, and influenced the development of its institutions.

Situated on a navigable river, within easy reach of the sea, yet far enough away to be safe from the pirates who in those early days infested the Mediterranean, the new city grew rapidly. By the commercial enterprise of the inhabitants, it had attained considerable wealth and importance in very early times, as is shown by the surviving monuments of the regal period, which are constructed on too grand a scale to have been the work of the citizens of an insignificant town.

Encompassed as they were by hostile nations, composed in

many cases of men who appear to have been their superiors in individual strength and prowess, the Romans were obliged to rely for their preservation on superior discipline and organization, and to subordinate the interests of the individual to the good of the state. Discipline, as has often been pointed out, was the secret of Rome's success; just as in the athletic contests of our own time 'team-play', the harmonious action of individuals as one body, triumphs over stronger but less perfectly organized opponents.

This conclusion is supported by the early legends. We find no great national hero, whose valor or military genius leads to victory and conquest. There is no Roman Achilles, nor even a Pyrrhus or a Hannibal. We read of senators called from the plough to the command of legions, of fathers who put their sons to death because they disobeyed their general's orders. The worthies of old Roman story typify discipline; they were plain men, of moderate ability, but of sterling integrity, and full of devotion to the interests of their country. The knowledge of arms of Pyrrhus and Hannibal at first triumphed over them, but Rome's citizen-soldiers always gained the victory at last.

But the conduct of Rome after a victory, which was due to the circumstances of her origin, had a no less important bearing on her progress than the victories themselves. Her leaders were not professional soldiers, but statesmen who were led to take the field by necessity. They often made poor generals, but they knew how to make a wise use of the victories which they finally won.

Wherever the Romans conquered, they founded colonies, and their colonies were not, like those of Greece, independent of the mother city, nor like those of many modern nations, a

source of weakness and a point of attack in time of war: but closely welded to the state they were veritable 'bulwarks of the commonwealth.' How wonderfully successful the Romans were in this respect is shown by the conduct of her colonies during that dark period when Hannibal swept like a storm over the fertile plains of Italy. In the field army after army succumbed to his generalship, but all his art could not induce the allies to forsake the Roman cause.

By thus dealing with the widely different nations which surrounded her, the Etruscans, the Samnites, the Greeks, and the Gauls, Rome learned the lessons which fitted her to rule the world, and developed the institutions and characteristics which were to have so important an influence on the destinies of the human race.

Of these institutions two had a far-reaching effect on the growth of Christianity, the Roman law and the Roman religion.

While in most cases it was the service of Rome to perpetuate and hand down to us the results reached by others, the Roman law was an original creation, whose development was greatly influenced by the early days of the nation. A state which is composed from the outset of different elements must cast aside tradition, and make its laws for the common good, on the principles of abstract justice, in order to deal equitably by all classes of citizens.

That the Romans very soon busied themselves with the solution of this problem, we may infer from the early legends, which represent Romulus, Numa, and Servius Tullius as legislators. The result was a code, which though at first of inexorable severity, was generally recognized as just, and hence attained the sacredness which only such law can have. Dur-

ing the whole of the bitter struggle between the patricians and the plebeians this feeling towards the law was manifest. There was no bloodshed, secession from the community was the only refuge of the oppressed, and the separate steps by which the plebeians gained their rights were taken in due legal form by the regular passage of successive rogations.

During the Republican era the law passed through a process of liberalization and humanization, and finally, through the Code of Justinian, became the basis of the law of all civilized nations. "Every one of us," says Ihne, "is benefitted directly or indirectly by this legacy of the Roman people, a legacy as valuable as the literary and artistic models which we owe to the great sculptors and writers of Greece."

The influence of the spirit of the Roman law on the Latin Church and the Latin theology may clearly be traced. The organization of the Church was a reproduction, on higher lines, of that of the old Roman commonwealth, and such an organization was of the highest importance to the existence of the new faith. As Milman says, "The life and death of Christianity depended on the rise of such a power. It is impossible to conceive what had been the confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the Middle Ages without mediæval papacy."

Not less significant for the early history of Christianity were the peculiarities of the Roman religion. This was not inspiration; the unimaginative Roman developed no mythology, and his pantheon bore the stamp of his political organization and of the legal bent of his mind. The relation of man and his god was that of debtor and creditor. He struck a bargain with the deities, offering faithful service in exchange for protection and all the good things of life. The relation was

purely legal, and all the subtleties of the law could be employed by either of the contracting parties. Each was bound to carry out his part of the contract with scrupulous exactness; but if the man could take advantage of his god, by substituting the letter for the spirit of the law, it was perfectly proper for him to do so: and we are told that the pious Numa outwitted Jupiter himself, and offered bloodless instead of human sacrifices.

But on the other hand, in dealing with a superior being, of far greater power and knowledge than himself, the mortal must be careful not to run the risk of being overreached himself. He must strive to be letter perfect in all his prayers and ceremonials, since a mistake in a single word, or the omission of a single form, made his devotions of no avail.

Such a religion, with its multiplicity of deified abstractions, with its excessive formalism, naturally failed to impress the mind with reverence and awe, or to satisfy man's natural craving for a superior power to bow to and lean on for protection. After looking in vain to the religions of other nations for this missing element, the educated classes turned to the speculations of Greek philosophy; while the vulgar, longing for the mysterious and the awful, became the prey of soothsayers, fortune-tellers, and religious quacks of all nationalities.

Not a few also, as we may judge from the precepts of Seneca, which, as is well known, correspond in a striking way to those of St. Paul, had an innate desire for a nobler and purer life.

Thus at the dawn of Christianity lack of faith in the existing theology, and the failure of all known creeds to satisfy men, made the times ripe for a true religion. The Christian view of the life after death must have been especially attrac-

tive; nothing is more melancholy than the utter lack of hopefulness regarding the hereafter which is manifested by the beautiful Attic sepulchral reliefs and the grave-inscriptions of pagan Rome. Caesar's celebrated speech during the trial of Catiline's fellow conspirators is an index of the feeling of cultivated men of the epoch; while Constantine's words before the Council of Nicæa show the change which Christianity had wrought.

The people turned eagerly to a faith which offered forgiveness of sins and an eternal life to great and lowly alike, and the converts were not only from among the wretched and oppressed; within a century all parts of the empire, and all classes of society, were represented in the growing Church.

Another feature of the Roman religion which was important for the early history of the Church, was the tolerance which characterized it from the beginning. To such a religion tolerance was easy; it was even a necessity. No war was ever waged by the state against religion. It was considered the duty of a foreigner to worship his own gods when in Rome; and just as the inhabitants of a conquered town might be enrolled among the Roman citizens, so their gods were often formally naturalized and became members of the Roman theogony. In any case all established religions were tolerated and even protected.

So long, therefore, as Christianity was regarded as a sect of the Jews, it was unmolested. When, however, it became clear that they had no connection with the Jews, the Christians fell under suspicion as members of one of those secret societies or clubs, which, since they were usually of a political character, were regarded as a menace to the state.

Christianity was therefore unassailed at a very critical

period in its growth; and when the persecutions finally came, they were powerless to extirpate a faith which had permeated the entire empire. The persecutions themselves were political rather than religious in their nature. Oftentimes they were due to the caprice or depravity of the emperor or his advisors, often to purely political considerations; and their results were rather to strengthen than to weaken the Church. Men were led to ask themselves what power it could be which gave the martyrs such firmness under the most fearful tortures; and inquiry made them converts. Thus the Church grew in numbers and in strength until finally it became the state religion, and found in the Roman empire a potent instrument for the propagation of its beliefs.

The art and music of the early Church also owed much to Rome, for although she originated nothing in those lines, she performed an inestimable service in preserving the sculpture, painting, and music of the Greeks. The influence of Græco-Roman art on the early Christian art is very marked. In the crude paintings of the catacombs we see the familiar personages and legends of the old mythology used to illustrate biblical story. Hermes bearing a goat on his shoulder, an old Greek type, appears as the good shepherd; Arion and the dolphin, as Jonah and the whale. Orpheus charming the wild beasts by his divine music readily represents Daniel in the den of lions; while Odysseus bound to the mast, in order to escape the allurements of the Sirens, depicts the Church triumphantly passing through the temptations of the world.

The Roman music, too, which was borrowed from the Greek, had an important influence on that of the early Church; while a survey of the patristic literature shows the immense value of the Latin language as a means of spreading the faith.

In conclusion it may be said that in the growth of the Roman empire from its cradle on the Palatine Hill we trace the rise of a means of fostering and perpetuating the Christian religion, such as could not have been devised by the wisest human counsels, such as we are forced to believe must have been planned by an all-wise and far-seeing Providence from the foundation of the world.

II.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

CHRISTIANITY AS A SOCIAL FORCE.

PROF. H. C. ADAMS.

Delivered April 3, 1893.

JOHN I, 1-10.

The question upon which you have asked me to speak might be considered in either of two ways. One form of treatment calls for a historical survey of the centuries which have passed since the teachings of Jesus began to exert a positive influence upon the social and political character of the Western world; the other form of treatment, which is analytic rather than historical, inquires respecting the real nature of the influence which the teachings of Jesus exert, and endeavors to measure the extent to which they are now potent, to discover the agencies which oppose their full efficiency, and to learn how a consistent disciple to the Great Master should conduct himself as a member of political and industrial society in our nineteenth century. I have chosen to follow the second of the methods suggested, partly because in this manner I shall be able to avoid many questions that are in dispute among students of religious history, and partly because I am sure an inquiry into Christian conduct will be of greater assistance to those who are earnestly endeavoring to follow the law of Christ through the intricate relations of modern life, than any historical survey of the *Gesta Christi* of the past.

The first reflection that presents itself comes in the form of an inquiry. Is it true that the rule of Christian living is more

difficult to follow at the present time than in former centuries? I think it is. Life itself is more complex than formerly; one's conduct touches a larger circle of neighbors than ever before; the final results of what one chooses to do are with greater difficulty ascertained than when society was local in character and simple in habit. Especially is this true when applied to business conduct, and on this account it seems peculiarly difficult for a man immersed in business to follow that simple rule which Jesus laid down as a test of the true life.

But what is the rule which the founder of the Christian religion accepted as the rule of right conduct and what is there peculiar in its application to the commercial spirit of our time?

The life of Jesus has always appeared to me to separate itself from the life of every other man with whom history has made us acquainted in that he appreciated most clearly the liberties and duties of his fellow-men. He possessed in a degree which makes his character unique the ability to recognize the two personalities which must always be taken into account, when any question of right or wrong presents itself for decision. He was always conscious of his own individuality, but never lost sight of that existence external to himself which, for want of a better name, we call society. Individual consciousness and social consciousness were to him equally real and equally potent, and all his judgments were such as to effect a perfect balance between the claims of egoism and altruism.

I remember to have once listened to an explanation by a student of Browning of the poem entitled, "Fra Lippo Lippi." It is necessary, said he, in order to appreciate this writer, to understand in all its details the facts to which his poems refer, and to recognize that one side only of all conversations is presented in the text; and the explanation of the poem referred to

consisted in supplying the suppressed questions and replies of the persons with whom the hero of the poem conversed. To my mind, it is necessary to follow a mental process quite analogous to this, if we would understand the ethical teachings of Jesus. He always spoke as a judge who, before pronouncing judgment, or before laying down a rule of conduct, had listened to the special pleas of self-interest on the one hand, and of social interest on the other. Jesus, it is true, never undertook to explain the rules he laid down. He was content to assert the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and to say in simple language, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" for he well knew that what he said was to be accepted for all times and for all conditions. It is for us, whose decisions are confined to the age in which we live, to undertake the explanation of these rules of conduct; for, until we understand the principles upon which they rest, we cannot apply them to the practical problems which beset us, nor make Christianity a positive force in society.

It would be interesting to follow out in greater detail an analysis of the political principles which underlie the teachings of Jesus, for they disclose in every significant utterance the sense of dual personality which I have suggested. An application of them to the past eighteen centuries of history would show that the world has thus far failed to realize the teachings of Jesus because it has failed to appreciate the necessity of a just balance between the rights and duties of man considered individually and of men considered collectively. And of special interest would it be to consider the assertion sometimes made that the social philosophy of individualism, which has swayed the minds of men since the Reformation, is so far removed from the law of Jesus that it is impossible for

the truest and highest Christian qualities to flourish under its influence. From these considerations, however, I turn aside and confine myself to one or two suggestions respecting the personal conduct of those who desire to see the Kingdom of Peace established on earth.

The first thought which presents itself is the following: A true disciple of Jesus, by which I mean one who desires above all things else that Christianity should become a social force, positive, aggressive and directive in character, must assume the ethical teachings of Jesus as an unalterable premise in the discussion of every social, political, industrial, or personal question. He is at liberty, like any one else, to discuss expedients if he confine the discussion to the minor premises of his reasoning; but his major premise which embodies at once the ideal of Christian society and the principles of Christian conduct, is for him beyond discussion. As he is a Christian, he has that within him which responds to the teachings of Jesus; as he is a man, he believes there is a cord in the breast of every other man which will respond when touched by a clear vision of the purity and beauty of the Christian ideal. He is obliged, therefore, to start in every discussion with the statement of the ethical rules which he accepts and to refuse discussion on any platform which does not admit those rules,

The assertion of such a position is indeed far-reaching in its results. I once heard a course of lectures on free trade and protection. The speaker began by quoting from St. Paul: "If any provide not for his own, especially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel," and proceeded to show that this precept was applicable to national policy and justified the United States in looking out for its own interests, even if in so doing it disregarded the interests of

other peoples. I have nothing to say respecting the conclusions of the argument which followed, but the moral character of this argument was certainly unchristian. Indeed, if we accept the old definition that, "Blasphemy is to attribute to God what is contrary to his nature," the argument justifies a harsher name. Certainly Christianity is not a social force so far as this question is concerned, when the common arguments respecting it rest upon an unchristian premise. And yet this rule that every man shall confine his regard to his own interests rather than the rule of Christ, that each man should have an equal regard for his neighbor and for himself, is the one to which the social, political and commercial conduct of our day conforms. The infidelity of our century, and this is the only form of infidelity to be feared, is disbelief in the golden rule of conduct. If Christianity ever comes to exert a positive influence in the direction of the affairs of men, it will be through the persistent assertion on the part of the disciples of Jesus that this rule is paramount, that it is universal in its application, and that every interest opposed to it is an unchristian interest.

My second suggestion is one which unless carefully stated will surely lead to misapprehension. If you have followed me thus far in what I regard as simply the logical unfolding of the Christian principle of conduct, you will doubtless say to yourselves as the disciples of old once said to Jesus: "This is a hard saying." It is indeed a hard saying when taken in connection with the facts of modern life, because it calls for conduct wholly at variance with the conduct of the great majority of men, and for decisions which, strictly adhered to, would exclude the Christian from many forms of business which promise business success. The same is true of political life and political meth-

ods, although I do not think that departure from Christian teachings is as systematic in politics as in the business walks of life. In politics, at least so far as the acquirement of office is concerned, we hold to the theory of right conduct, any departure from which we call corruption; and it should be further noted that inasmuch as the principle of publicity is applied to political affairs, disregard of right conduct is more likely to be made known. This in large measure explains why corruption in political affairs impresses itself more strongly upon us. Occasionally a man comes to the front in political life who cares more for the method by which success is acquired than for success itself, and the fact that he is sure to find a constituency, although sometimes a small one, shows our political aims to be purer than our business motives. In business life a man never secures a constituency because he holds to moral rules in the management of his affairs, but rather because he can furnish cheaper goods than his rivals. If you look carefully into the matter you will, I think, admit that the principle underlying business conduct is unchristian in character. It has no regard to the justice of transactions but to the legality of transactions. It does not, as in political affairs, still hold to the ideal of purity, but owing probably to the greater complexity of business relations, it has fitted its ethical judgment to the requirements of existing law. Business conduct, therefore, is never as a rule more perfect than the law which enforces technical honesty. As DeQuincey says, although his remark held in mind something different from the use I now make of it, "by daily use the ethics of a police office translate themselves insensibly into the ethics even of a religious people."

Under such circumstances what is the true rule of Christian conduct? I assume that the end held in view is not alone

to develop character in the individual but to make the law of Christ a positive force in the direction and government of society. If this be accepted as the end to be attained, to limit ourselves to exhortation is to render the accomplishment of our purpose forever impossible; for it must not be forgotten that we live in a society adjusted to the requirements of competition, and that in such a society men who produce goods most cheaply, no matter what methods they may have adopted to attain cheapness, will gain our patronage. This is true because it is practically impossible for purchasers to know the conditions under which goods are produced, and to confine their purchases to the men who, as producers, follow the rules which justice and equity require. This, perhaps, was possible when society was simple and local in character, as for example, in England in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; it is, however, impossible now that industrial conditions are cosmopolitan and complex. In the fact thus brought to our notice do we find an explanation of the curious paradox, that the more effective the persuasion of religious teachers who confine their teaching to exhortation, and who devote all their energies to persuade men to live rightly, the more rapid will be the deterioration of business society. "For, since the result of such persuasion must be a renunciation by men of delicate consciences of the great business opportunities, society will tend to take upon itself the moral tone of the most unscrupulous." This result, indeed, has already been reached. The actual business conduct of men at the present time is conformed to the rule of the Justinian digest, which says: "In purchase and sale it is naturally allowed to the contracting parties to try to over-reach each other," and in so doing disregards the rule of Christ, which says: "Whatever ye would that men should do to you do ye also

unto them.” The former is the heathen rule of conduct, the latter is the Christian rule of conduct, and it is not too much to say that in business affairs the commercial spirit of the nineteenth century is essentially heathen.

What then is the Christian business man to do? Can he renounce business? Nothing, to my mind, deserves greater censure than such a suggestion. The life of the hermit is not the life which Jesus intended a man to live. A man may be selfish even in the pursuit of holiness, and consequently never attain holiness. But of more importance is the thought that one who withdraws from business affairs cannot hope to exert any influence upon them, and the theme we are discussing this morning is how the rule of Christian conduct may become a social force. It is, indeed, an exceedingly difficult rôle the Christian, as a business man, is called upon to assume. For, while holding strenuously to the highest law so far as faith is concerned, he is obliged to conform in large measure to the rules of conduct adopted by those with whom he has business dealings. He is obliged to accept moral dualism, not only as inevitable, but under the legal conditions and commercial customs of the times, as in the highest degree moral. What makes him a follower of Jesus is not his refusal to recognize that in a business transaction, “each contracting party tries to over-reach the other,” but his recognition that this is at variance with the law of Christ. He is justified in protecting his own interests by the methods which the law calls honest; but if he be a Christian he will assign to himself, as the highest aim of life, the task of doing what he may to so change laws and modify customs that the old Christian conception of a just price, and the modern Christian conception of equal opportunities for all, may become a realized fact. Not until then will the neces-

sity for moral dualism pass away, and not until then can the law of Christ exert its full influence as a social force and bestow all the blessings of which it is capable.

I am painfully aware of the imperfect manner in which I have presented to you what is suggested in this paper, and I appreciate fully how dangerous it is to advocate dualism in matters of conduct; all I ask is that you consider this suggestion carefully, and should it meet your approval, and should you purpose to carry it with you into the busy lives that await you, that you apply it with that conscientious care which marks a lover of truth.

CHRISTIANITY AND DEMOCRACY.

PROF. JOHN DEWEY.

Delivered March 20, 1892.

Looked at from the outside, a religion seems to be a cult and a body of doctrine. It seems to be a cult; that is, a collection of specific acts to be performed, and of special ideas to be cherished in consciousness. The acts, the cult, may be more or less prescribed, more or less detailed, more or less formal, but some special acts there must be. It is these acts which have religious meaning, which are worship, while other acts are outside the pale, are secular, or profane, commercial or merely moral—they are not communion with God. So, too, the dogmas, the doctrine, may be more or less narrow, more or less rigid, but it seems there must be some special body of ideas set up and apart as belonging to the religious consciousness, while other ideas are scientific, or artistic, or industrial. This is the appearance. Research into the origin and development of religion destroys the appearance. It is shown that every religion has its source in the social and intellectual life of a community or race. Every religion is an expression of the social relations of the community; its rites, its cult, are a recognition of the sacred and divine significance of these relationships. The religion is an expression of the mental attitude and habit of a people; it is its reaction, æsthetic and scientific, upon the world in which the people finds itself. Its ideas, its dogmas and mysteries are recogni-

tions, in symbolic form, of the poetic, social and intellectual value of the surroundings. In time this significance, social and intellectual, is lost sight of; it is so thoroughly condensed in the symbols, the rites, the dogmas, that they seem to be the religion. They become an end in themselves. Thus separated from life they begin to decay; it seems as if religion were disintegrating. In reality, the very life, the very complexus of social and intellectual inter-actions which give birth to these forms, is already and continuously at work finding revelation and expression in more adequate relations and truths.

If there is no religion which is simply a religion, least of all is Christianity simply a religion. Jesus had no cult or rite to impose; no specific forms of worship, no specific acts named religion. He was clear to the other side. He proclaimed this very setting up of special acts and institutions as part of the imperfections of life. "The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem worship the Father. . . . The hour cometh and now is when true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth"—the hour when worship should be simply the free and truthful expression of man in his action. Jesus had no special doctrine to impose—no special set of truths labeled religions. "If *any* man will *do* his *will*, he shall know of the doctrine." "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." The only truth Jesus knew of as religious was Truth. There were no special religious truths which He came to teach; on the contrary, his doctrine was that Truth, however named and however divided by man, is one as God is one; that getting hold of truth and living by it is religion. Dr. Mulford in his "Republic of God," holds that Christianity is not a religion at all, having no cult and no dogma of its own to mark it off from

action and truth in general. The very universality of Christianity precludes its being a religion. Christianity, Dr. Mulford contends, is not a religion but a revelation.

The condition of revelation is that it reveal. Christianity, if universal, if revelation, must be the continuously unfolding, never ceasing discovery of the meaning of life. Revelation is the ascertaining of life. It cannot be more than this; it must be all of this. Christianity then cannot stand or fall with any special theory or mode of action with which men at a given time may choose to identify it. Christianity in its reality knows no such exclusive or sectarian attitude. If it be made to stand or fall with any special theory, historical or ethical, if it be identified with some special act, ecclesiastic or ceremonial, it has denied its basis and its destiny. The one claim that Christianity makes is that God is truth; that as truth He is love and reveals Himself fully to man, keeping back nothing of himself; that man is so one with the truth thus revealed that it is not so much revealed *to* him as *in* him; he is its incarnation; that by the appropriation of truth, by identification with it, man is free; free negatively, free from sin, free positively, free to live his own life, free to express himself, free to play without let or limitation upon the instrument given him—the environment of natural wants and forces. As revelation, Christianity must reveal. The only tests by which it can be tried are the tests of fact—is there truth constantly ascertained and appropriated by man? Does a life loyal to the truth bring freedom?

It is obvious that in other religions there is no great inconsistency in the claim of certain men to be the special representatives of religion, insisting that there are certain specific ideas to be held, certain special acts to be performed, as relig-

ions. No other religion has ever generalized its basis and its motive, apprehending the universality of truth, and its consequent self-revealing power to everyone. But in Christianity the attempt to fix religious truth once for all, to hold it within certain rigid limits, to say this and just this is Christianity, is self-contradictory. The revelation of truth must continue as long as life has new meanings to unfold, new action to propose. An organization may loudly proclaim its loyalty to Christianity and to Christ; but if, in asserting its loyalty, it assumes a certain guardianship of Christian truth, a certain prerogative in laying down what is this truth, a certain exclusiveness in the administration of religious conduct, if in short the organization attempts to preach a fixity in a moving world and to claim a monopoly in a common world—all this is a sign that the real Christianity is now working outside of and beyond the organization, that the revelation is going on in wider and freer channels.

The historic organization called the church has just learned one lesson of this sort. There was a time when the church assumed the finality of its ideas upon the relations of God and the world, and of the relations of nature and man. For centuries the visible church assumed that it was the guardian and administrator of truth in these matters. It not only strove against the dawning and rising science as false, but it called this science impious and anti-Christian, till science almost learned to call herself by the name so positively and continuously fixed upon her. But it turned out then as ever—truth exists not in word, but in power. As in the parable of the two sons, the one who boasted of his readiness to serve in the vineyard went not, while the younger son who said he would not go, went out into the vineyard of nature and by obedience to

the truth revealed the deeper truth of unity of law, the presence of one continuous living force, the conspiring and vital unity of all the world. The revelation was made in what we term science. The revelation could not be interrupted on account of the faithlessness of the church, it pushed out in the new channel.

Again, I repeat, revelation must reveal. It is not simply a question of the reality declared, it is also a question of comprehension by him to whom the reality is declared. A Hindoo religion, a Greek religion, might place its religious truths in mysteries which were not comprehended. A religion of revelation must uncover and discover; it must bring home its truth to the consciousness of the individual. Revelation undertakes, in a word, not only to state that the truth of things is such and such, it undertakes to give the individual organs for the truth, organs by which he can get hold of, can see and feel, the truth.

To overlook this side of revelation is to keep the word but deny the fact. Of late, the theologians, as well as the philosophers, have been turning their guns upon agnosticism, the doctrine that God, and the fundamental realities of life, are hid from man's knowledge. What is true for one must be true for another, and if agnosticism is false, false also is the doctrine that revelation is the process by which an external God declares to man certain fixed statements about himself and the methods of His working. God is essentially and only the self-revealing, and the revelation is complete only as men come to realize Him.

So much for the first part of my subject. Christianity is revelation, and revelation means effective discovery, the actual ascertaining or guaranteeing to man of the truth of his life and the reality of the Universe.

It is at this point that the significance of democracy appears. The kingdom of God, as Christ said, is within us, or among us. The revelation is, and can be, only in intelligence. It is strange to hear men call themselves Christian teachers, and at the same time condemn the use of reason and of thought in relation to Christian truth. Christianity as revelation is not only to, it is *in* man's thought and reason. Beyond all other means of appropriating truth, beyond all other organs of apprehension, is man's own action. Man interprets the Universe in which he lives in terms of his own action at the given time. Had Jesus Christ made an absolute, detailed and explicit statement upon all the facts of life, that statement would not have had meaning—it would not have been revelation—until men began to realize in their own action the truth he declared—until they themselves began to *live* it. In final analysis, man's own action, his own life movement, is the only organ he has for receiving and appropriating truth. Man's action is found in his social relationships—the way in which he connects with his fellows. It is man's social organization, the state in which he is expressing himself, which always has and always must set the form and sound the keynote to the understanding of Christianity.

Jesus himself taught that the individual is free in his life because the individual is the organ of the absolute Truth of the Universe. I see no reason for believing that Jesus meant this in any but its most general sense; I do not see any reason for supposing that he meant that the individual is free simply in some one special direction or department; I do not see any reason for supposing that his teaching of truth's accessibility to man is to be taken in any unnatural or limited way. Yet the world to which these ideas were taught did not find itself

free, and did not find the road to truth so straight and open. Slaveryes of all sort abounded; the individual found himself enslaved to nature and to his fellows. He found ignorance instead of knowledge; darkness instead of light. These facts fixed the method of interpretation for that time. It was impossible that the teachings of Jesus should be understood in their direct, natural sense when the whole existing world of action seemed to contradict them. It was inevitable that these teachings should be deflected and distorted through their medium of interpretation—the existing conditions of action.

The significance of democracy as revelation is that it enables us to get truths in a natural, every-day and practical sense which otherwise could be grasped only in a somewhat unnatural or sentimental sense. I assume that democracy is a spiritual fact and not a mere piece of governmental machinery. If there is no God, no law, no truth in the universe, or if this God is an absentee God, not actually working, then no social organization has any spiritual meaning. If God is, as Christ taught, at the root of life, incarnate in man, then democracy has a spiritual meaning which it behooves us not to pass by. Democracy is freedom. If truth is at the bottom of things, freedom means giving this truth a chance to show itself, a chance to well up from the depths. Democracy, as freedom, means the loosening of bonds; the wearing away of restrictions, the breaking down of barriers, of middle walls, of partitions. Through this doing away with restrictions, whatever truth, whatever reality there is in man's life is freed to express itself. Democracy is, as freedom, the freeing of truth. Truth makes free, but it has been the work of history to free truth—to break down the walls of isolation and of class interest which held it in and under. The idea that man can enact "law" in

the social sphere any more than in the so called "physical" sphere simply shows with how little seriousness, how little faith, men have taken to themselves the conception of God incarnate in humanity. Man can but discover law by uncovering it. He can uncover it only by freeing life, by freeing expression, so that the truth may appear with more conscious and more compelling force.

The spiritual unification of humanity, the realization of the brotherhood of man, all that Christ called the Kingdom of God is but the further expression of this freedom of truth. The truth is not fully freed when it gets into some individual's consciousness, for him to delectate himself with. It is freed only when it moves in and through this favored individual to his fellows; when the truth which comes to consciousness in one, extends and distributes itself to all so that it becomes the Common-wealth, the Republic, the public affair. The walls broken down by the freedom which is democracy, are all the walls preventing the complete movement of truth. It is in the community of truth thus established that the brotherhood, which is democracy, has its being. The supposition that the ties which bind men together, that the forces which unify society, can be other than the very laws of God, can be other than the outworking of God in life, is a part of that same practical unbelief in the presence of God in the world which I have already mentioned. Here then we have democracy! on its negative side, the breaking down of the barriers which hold truth from finding expression, on its positive side, the securing of conditions which give truth its movement, its complete distribution or service. It is no accident that the growing organization of democracy coincides with the rise of science, including the machinery of telegraph and locomotive for dis-

tributing truth. There is but one fact—the more complete movement of man to his unity with his fellows through realizing the truth of life.

Democracy thus appears as the means by which the revelation of truth is carried on. It is in democracy, the community of ideas and interest through community of action, that the incarnation of God in man (man, that is to say, as organ of universal truth) becomes a living, present thing, having its ordinary and natural sense. This truth is brought down to life; its segregation removed; it is made a common truth enacted in all departments of action, not in one isolated sphere called religious.

Is the isolated truth about to welcome its completion in the common truth? Is the partial revelation ready to die as partial in order to live in the fuller? This is the practical question which faces us. Can we surrender—not simply the bad *per se*—but the possessed good in order to lay hold of a larger good? Shall we welcome the revelation of truth now going on in democracy as a wider realization of the truth formerly asserted in more or less limited channels and with a more or less unnatural meaning? As democracy comes to consciousness itself, becomes aware of its own spiritual basis and content, this question will confront us more and more. We are here in the University to think, that is to say, to get hold of the best tools of action. It is our duty not to float with the currents of opinion, but to ask and answer this question for ourselves in order that we may give some answer when others begin to ask it. Will the older formulation, inherited from days when the organization of society was not democratic, when truth was just getting its freedom and its unity through freedom,—will this formulation strive and con-

tend against the larger revelation because it comes from what seems to be outside its own walls, or will it welcome it joyously and loyally, as the fuller expression of its own idea and purpose?

It is your business and mine to answer this question for ourselves. If we answer it for ourselves we shall answer it for more, many more than ourselves; for it is in our hands and in the hands of such as we are, to get this question decided beyond a peradventure. There is no better time than the present for the solution; there is no better place for it than the University of Michigan—an institution based upon inquiry into truth and upon democracy. Can anyone ask for better or more inspiring work? Surely to fuse into one the social and the religious motive, to break down the barriers of Pharesaism and self-assertion which isolate religious thought and conduct from the common life of man, to realize the state as one Commonwealth of truth—surely this is a cause worth battling for.

Remember Lot's wife, who looked back, and who, looking back, was fixed into a motionless pillar.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE NEWSPAPER.

PROF. FRED N. SCOTT.

Delivered March 13, 1892.

“The Lord is God of the living only, the dead have another God.” I take these words from a curious prose fragment by the poet Coleridge, entitled “The Wanderings of Cain.” The first murderer and his little son are represented in their journeyings by night as coming upon the ghost of Abel.

“The Shape that was like Abel raised himself up and spake to the child: ‘I know where the cold waters are, but I may not drink, wherefore didst thou then take away my pitcher?’ But Cain said: ‘Didst thou not find favor in the sight of the Lord thy God?’ The Shape answered, ‘The Lord is God of the living only, the dead have another God.’ Then the child Enos lifted up his eyes and prayed; but Cain rejoiced secretly in his heart. ‘Wretched shall they be all the days of their mortal life,’ exclaimed the Shape, ‘who sacrifice worthy and acceptable sacrifices to the God of the dead, but after death their toil ceaseth. Woe is me, for I was well beloved by the God of the living, and cruel wert thou, O my brother, who didst snatch me away from his power and dominion.’”

“The Lord is God of the living only, the dead have another God.” These words of Abel, or words startlingly similar in their import, may be heard to-day in the mouths of no small number of men who call themselves Christians. There is one God of the dead—a God of the Palestine of two or three thous-

and years ago. Offer acceptable sacrifice to him and be wretched all the days of your life, in order that after death you may cease from toil. There is another God, a rather commonplace and homely deity, who has to do with Congress and the Standard Oil company and street-car lines and telephones and dissecting-rooms, whose power is of a lower and less glorious character. Make sacrifice to this God and your chances for the future are somewhat doubtful.

Such is the implication of no small part of the religious talk one hears and the religious literature one reads. Ancient things, simply because of their age, are accounted as worthy of peculiar reverence. It is as though one God were thought to be interested in persons and institutions of the past, another and a somewhat inferior God in those of the present. Say what you please, the God who provided for the transportation of the Hebrews across the Sinaitic peninsula is, in the minds of the majority of men, a more god-like being than the one who watches your arrow-like flight from here to the Pacific coast in a Pullman palace car.

This species of polytheism, if I may call it so, is responsible, as it seems to me, for serious misinterpretations of the facts of modern life. I am anxious that in what I have to say this morning it may not vitiate my conclusions. I shall endeavor, therefore, in treating my topic, to speak from a purely monotheistic point of view. I shall try not to make any distinction between the God who spake amid thunders from Mt. Sinai, and the God who speaks from the clatter of the newspaper press, between the God who shook Calvary with an earthquake, and the God who supplies Detroit with natural gas, between the God of the uncommon and the clean, and the God of the common and the unclean.

It is the purpose of this paper to ask the meaning of that very common and sometimes very unclean social fact, the modern newspaper; more particularly to inquire into its relation to Christian belief and practice. As it will be necessary at the outset to define the term Christianity, I will begin by stating what, in my opinion, Christianity is *not* :

In the first place, it is not a religion.

In the second place, it is not embodied in creeds or dogmas.

In the third place, it is not a closet into which men can withdraw from contact with the material things of life.

In the fourth place, it is not a scheme for saving individuals.

Let me explain what I mean by these four negatives, which, standing thus in isolation, may seem harsh and even inconsistent. First, Christianity is not a religion. It is no easy task to frame such a definition of religion as will meet the approval of all, even of those who are here present, but I think we should in the main agree upon the following: Religion is the conscious desire to be one with God, and the satisfaction of that desire through conduct in our daily life. This is a broad definition which covers and is intended to cover all the so-called religions known to history. For my own part, I find it impossible to look upon Buddhism, upon the Greek and Roman observances, upon the beliefs of the primitive Aryans, as lying without the circle of religious history. One of the most profoundly significant passages in all the New Testament is that contained in St. Paul's address to the Athenians on Mar's Hill: "God . . . hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth . . . that they should seek the Lord if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from every one of us."

The apostle, if I interpret him aright, means there is but one God, and that he is God of the whole universe. In him literally do all things live and move and have their being, and in so far as men at any and all times have sought after this divine being and have found him in the world about them, and have lived out their beliefs, in so far have they had truly religious lives, whether it were in Africa, or Japan, or primeval America.

I know that this view has not been generally held. Perhaps it is not even now the common view. There have been those—there may be yet—who divide all religions into true and false beliefs, or into religions and superstitions. It has been thought that Christianity could be glorified by contrasting it with other religions. The darker they were painted, the more material, sensual and depraved they were made to appear, the brighter it was supposed would be the shining forth of that ray which is believed to be the light of the world. Even some well-meaning historians and philosophers, through mistaken zeal for a good cause, have laid on the colors with a careless hand. But one cannot go far in this depreciation of non-Christian religions without encountering serious obstacles. Men lived in India, Greece and Rome as noble, as earnest, as elevated in spirit as any who walk the earth to-day. History tells of priests of so-called false religions who believed devoutly, who strove to teach their people purity, uprightness, and religious faith. And what shall we say of such examples of pagan virtue as Socrates and Plato—men whose lofty sincerity puts all of us to shame, whose names are synonyms for devoutness, manhood, courage? We cannot talk of the darkness of paganism as though these men had never lived. That to be untrue to the facts, to become ourselves false priests. Swift,

in his Letter to a Young Clergyman, says that it was the custom in his day for ministers to seek to advance Christianity by abusing the Creek philosophers; but he has noticed that it is generally those who know least about the latter that find most to say in abuse of them. In the same way, we may say in general, that it is those who have but a vague, incoherent idea of the tenets of paganism who are loudest in denominating it wholly false and useless. Those who know these religions intimately and profoundly always speak of them with a respect bordering on reverence. Indeed it may be laid down as a safe maxim that any belief that has long held sway over a great number of human minds is worthy of respect. To despise it on the ground that it is not Christianity, shows an intolerance, a narrowness which is diametrically opposed to the central teaching of Christ himself.

The truth is that this view of the religions of the world is at bottom polytheistic. If there is but one God, there is, there can be, but one religion, in whatsoever various forms it may be manifested. I believe that this is so, that all the so-called great religions of history have been stages by which man has drawn steadily nearer to God, by which God has revealed himself with growing clearness to man. This approach of truth and humankind went on until the day when that revelation was made complete, when God and man met once for all upon the Mount of Olives and by the Sea of Galilee that they might forever after meet upon every hill and plain and by every stream the whole wide world over. Since that day, we who have shared in that revelation, have known, or should have known, all religion under the name of Christianity. There is no other name to call it by.

Christianity is not, therefore, *a* religion, one religion among

many. It is for us, precisely, religion, *the* religion, the modern religion, the only religion which it is possible for us to conceive. It is the process of the reconciliation of God and man which I have termed the essence of religion, brought openly to consciousness and thus revealed. Revealed, it is true, as never before, but so revealed because it gathered up into itself the significance of all previous anticipations of this revealing. The dreams of Buddha, the wistful hopes of Plato, the confident prophesies of Isaiah—all found themselves here realized.

This is no new idea. It is almost as old as the Christian era. The early Latin father, Tertullian, says that the human soul is naturally Christian. We do not bear Christianity to the heathen, we awaken it within them. And so Clement of Alexandria, one of the early Greek fathers, was of the belief that God had but one great plan for educating the world, of which Christianity was the final step. He considered the Greek religion a preparation for Christ's coming, little less significant than the Jewish dispensation.

It will now be apparent, I think, what is meant by my second negative, namely, that Christianity is not embodied in creeds or dogmas. In the first place, if Christianity is as big as all religion, no creed can hold it. A creed that contained the particulars of Christian belief would be a document as long as from here to the furthestmost fixed star, and in it would be written all the hopes and aspirations and struggles of the human soul since man appeared upon this planet. In the second place, no dogma can represent it, because a dogma is a fixed and rigid thing, whereas Christianity is ever growing and widening with the widening sympathies and interests of men. When you have put your leaven into the lump, it is folly to enclose the lump in an air-tight bottle. No, the essence of Christianity is

not in the dogma or the creed, but in the lives of men. And men grow. They want a better creed every day. Even though they use the old forms, they read new meanings in them. To a genuine, live Christian the words of the creed mean infinitely more to-day than they did yesterday, and to-morrow, because the interests of the man are growing and ramifying, will have fresh significance.

In the third place, Christianity, I have said, is not a closet into which men can withdraw from contact with the material things of life. The belief that it is so, seems to be an error held over from the Middle Ages. Such beliefs die hard. Certainly, it was no part of the teachings of Christ that man should do his work by withdrawing from the forum and the market. He had no theory to propose upon which men were to meditate. His was a gospel of action. It was a gospel to be lived out in conduct, in the relations of men, in the progress of civilization. Otherwise it would not have existed at all. It would have been a mere Utopian fancy, and have taken its place, with other such fancies, upon the dusty book shelves of libraries. Instead, it found embodiment in the works of men, the progress of wars, the building of churches and school-houses, the manufacture of clothing, the draining of swamps. It was the vital principle in that re-adjustment, that re-handling of materials, which we commonly recognize as the sign of the advance of civilization.

In the fourth place, Christianity is not a scheme for saving individuals. It is not that because it is something more. In economics and in politics men are passing beyond the merely individualistic view to a conception of the inter-actions of society. Man is no longer viewed as an isolated individual, but as part of a large social and national organism in which he per-

forms a certain function. But in religion this view seems not yet to have gained a foothold. Here again is a trace of polytheism. Christians are coming to accept the unity of society as a fact in politics, but are not yet ready to accept it in the domain of religious thought. Men are to be saved politically as members of the social organism; religiously they are to be saved as individuals, or as members of particular sects. The curious thing is that for the new conception in economics and politics, Christianity is itself responsible. It is the teaching of Christ regarding the brotherhood of man, the duty of doing to others as you would have others do to you, and the consequent widening of interest,—it is these influences which in fact and in theory have established the organic state. Yet by this conception, Christianity itself, as an object of reflection, seems the last to profit. If I read my Bible and the history of the world aright, the aim of Christianity is not to save isolated individuals, but to save mankind, to regenerate society, to effect the salvation of individuals as members of the community.

If we turn now to the positive side and ask what Christianity *is*, my answer will be as follows:

First, there is but one religion, and that, when in the history of the world it came home to the consciousness of mankind, men learned to call Christianity.

Second, Christianity is a social fact, manifesting itself not in isolated individuals, but in society as a whole. It is, indeed, the social element, the connecting links which make society out of mere individuals.

Third, Christianity exists to-day, not in creeds, but in the lives of men, and not in individual men, but in men as parts of the social organism. It is embodied in their institutions, in

their tools, in all their instruments of progress, in all their means of communication, in their laws, their prisons, their asylums, their schools, their places of business. It has found its way into material substances. Wherever iron and steel and copper have been so shaped as to serve as an instrument for bringing men closer together, there Christianity is embodied; and whosoever uses that instrument rightly is furthering, is inevitably furthering the spread of Christianity. In the same way, whoever is voting for laws which embody Christian principle, is working for Christ. He is making more efficient that organism in which society is working out its own salvation.

If we examine more closely into the character of this social organism, we shall find it to have three sides or aspects. We may even say that these have been indicated for us by our Savior himself. In answer to the query of the doubting Thomas, Christ is represented as saying, "I am the way, the truth and the life." If we may regard the whole record of Christianity simply as Christ writ large, we shall not go far astray in accepting this three-fold division, and asking to what elements of the social whole, these terms appear to correspond.

First, the *life*. The Christian life can include nothing less than the whole of conduct in so far as it in any sense and any degree, embodies Christian ideals; that is, develops the man, brings him into closer relation with his fellows, satisfies his need for free activity in ordered social relations. For example, it is my belief that the highest embodiment of Christ in politics is democracy. Therefore, in a real sense every act which furthers the efficiency of the United States government is, I hold, an act of the Christian life. Voting, keeping books, arresting criminals, teaching, running a mail train, all are as truly promoting the cause of Christ, as is going on missions to

South Africa, or giving large sums to charity. I do not care how far you push this inquiry. If we are monotheists, if we Christians in the true sense, we shall be obliged to confess that every act of the individual which furthers the onward movement toward social regeneration, is a fraction of the Christian life.

I see no cause for alarm in this. Surely, if men could be made to feel that not alone in the extraordinary observances of life, going to church and the like, but even in the pursuit of their ordinary business, they were growing into the likeness of Christ, it would be a blessed thing. But how can this be brought about? Simply, as it seems to me, by telling them the truth regarding the society of which they form a part. And this brings us to the second division.

Second, the *truth*. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." In other words, show to the business man, the farmer, the lawyer, the real meaning of the work in which he is engaged, and he will be set free, the chasm between his working life and his religious life will be bridged. He will cease being a *dividuum* and become an *individuum*. His integrity in the true sense, his oneness and wholeness of mind and purpose, will be restored. He will renounce polytheism and embrace monotheism. Such, I believe, is the result, in every case, of a genuine revelation to one's self of the meaning of all one's acts. It amounts to a conversion. It is the recovery of one's birthright. It is the conviction that life, in so far as it is real, is Christian,—Christian to the very core.

It is to achieve this end, as it seems to me, that all research which is worth while, is now being carried on. This is the real purpose of all investigation in science, in philos-

ophy, in economics, in the whole range of human knowledge, —it is simply a huge searching after Christianity, an attempt to bring home to men the meaning of their lives. Scientists have not as yet generally recognized this fact, nor have professing Christians yet recognized the scientists as their allies. Men, for long, could not see that Christianity is a world-phenomenon. They could not grasp the meaning of their own words. They said that Christ was the light of the world, but they thought of that light as shining on a few square miles of territory. They thought of him as the Christ of men, not the Christ of nature; as the Christ of the church, not the Christ of business, of art, of daily life. As a consequence men turned to nature as though God were not in her. They determined the motions of the planets and the phenomena of animal and vegetable life; and one day the wisest and most patient of them all, stood up in the assembly of wise men and said, Here, see, we have surprised the secret of the universe. All animal and vegetable life is a process in which the integrity of the organism is maintained by the co-operation of the individual members. What you call the growth of the animal or plant is but the differentiation of parts, which die as parts to reappear at the same moment as members of the whole body. And this idea was applied to plants and animals, to apes and men, to the history of society, government, and even religion. And this the wise men called evolution. And the wise men were right. They *had* surprised the secret of the universe. They had reported an evolution in human thought, a new attitude toward nature, an endeavor to grasp in terms of nature the workings of their own minds, in which by heredity and contact with the institutions of civilization, Christianity had become the law of movement. In other words, the Christian

conception of the social organism was working in their minds, giving them new insight into the facts of life. The church at first opposed the new idea, fought it, denied it, then yielded ground gradually, and finally came to see with shame that it was fighting Christianity itself. Perhaps even yet it does not see that the evolutionists are using the weapons of Christianity.

In the same way it could be shown that the study of history, or of constitutional law, is at bottom only a search for that Christianity which men in the course of the ages have embodied in the social order.

This truth of life, this embodiment of Christianity in human institutions, is to be brought home to men, but how shall this be accomplished? The life is so complex, so rapid in its movement, so varied, apparently so disorganized. Through what instrumentality can its meaning be conveyed? We now come to the third division, the way.

By the *way*, I mean any and every means of conveying to men the meaning of their lives, of demonstrating to them the truth of the growing organization of society through the embodiment of Christ's teachings in the institutions of government and the motives of men. Every means of this sort, through which man obtains his freedom, I am accustomed to call art. If we glance over the history of Christianity, we shall find that the earliest way was the spoken word. Christ delivered his teachings orally, and these again were spread, through the medium of his disciples, by word of mouth. Later these teachings were recorded in the symbols of speech by means of writing on parchment, papyrus, waxed tablets, or sheets of lead; and these became what we now call the New Testament. But as Christianity spread abroad it came to people who could not read, and for whom the simple words of the biblical record

were too abstruse. For them some simpler, more obvious method was demanded, some means that would convey directly and unmistakably the truth of the Christian life. It was in response to this demand that painting sprang up and ran its course through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. On the tombs of the catacombs, on the walls of the churches, in gigantic frescoes, on canvas and paper, the artists of that time told the whole story of the Bible for the hungry multitude. Miles and miles of convent and cathedral walls were covered with the record of our Saviour's life, passion, death and resurrection. The whole biblical history of man, from the legendary Fall of the Angels to the Last Judgment, was pictured again and again. Innumerable canvases were filled with deaths of martyrs, with legends of the monastic orders, with events in the lives of prophets and saints. In this way there was conveyed to the people, to the masses, in visible form, the meaning of the life they were leading. But painting could not forever supply this want. There was need for some means of diffusing knowledge more widely and more rapidly. The picture can be seen by but a limited number, and copies require time and cost much money. To remedy this defect came the printing press and the movable type. The spoken word could now be duplicated at slight expense and distributed as widely as need be. It is significant that the first volume thus distributed was a copy of the Bible.

From that time to the present the history of the means of conveying the truth to men has been mainly the history of the printing press. No very great change is noteworthy except the multiplication of presses, until we reach the opening of the present century. By that time the growing organization of society and the spread of democracy demanded a more rapid

distribution of the truth. The demand was met in two ways: by the invention of the cylinder press, and by the application of steam to the propulsion of boats and railway carriages. Later, came the invention of the telegraph. In the meantime the impression of the movable types had begun to take on a peculiar form to meet the exigencies of the time. The book was found too slow and clumsy to supply the needs of the constantly growing state. Periodicals soon sprang up, and at last papers that were published every day and which aimed to furnish a report of the social and political situation for that day or the one preceding. Not to give the history of newspapers at tedious length, it may be said that, for the past half century, their efforts have been directed toward conveying to mankind a true report of the meaning of life. The papers have not always succeeded in doing this; indeed they have seemed sometimes grossly to misrepresent life; and yet on the whole the tendency has been in the right direction. Were we able to bring all the results before us, we should find them to be of simply stupendous importance. It would be found that to-day on a scale never before attempted in the history of the world, the whole range of human activity is being pictured to men's minds, pictured not at long intervals, but daily, almost hourly. In a hitherto unprecedented way, that truth which is to make man free, and which is making him free, is fluttering down upon his door-step. The meaning of society, the steps in its onward progress, the evidences of the unity and the kinship of man, the record of the emancipation of humankind from ignorance and prejudice—all these are reflected in the columns of the daily paper, if not clearly, at least to be seen by those who will take the pains to look for them.

If there be any truth in this view, the connection between

the newspaper and Christianity needs no further demonstration. The newspaper is the most powerful ally that Christianity has ever had. That it fails in one point or another, that one editor is venal and another wrong-headed, proves nothing; rather it exhibits the direction which the advance is bound to take, namely, toward the elimination of the purely individual element. Humanity is no longer an infant crying in the night, and with no language but a cry. The infant has grown into a strong-limbed youth. The cry has become articulate, and now is passing into a language by which all men may hold communion. It is not enough that the press do what painting did. The social conditions have changed. It is not enough that newspaper men publish in a haphazard and arbitrary way whatever comes into their heads. Society has become organized and demands an organized instrument for the reporting of its workings and the distributing of its intelligence. Opinions, guesses, dreams, comments, in general, the whole dead mass of what is known as editorial matter, all this as the basis for action must give way before the influx of truth, the honest report of the facts which we need to help us in our living.

Shall we ever have such an instrument? Is it likely that the newspapers will ever band together into one great organism bent upon conveying the truth of life to the minds of all men? I am very confident that the time is not far distant when the logic of events will urge them to this step. I could, were this the proper time and place, give evidence that the movement has already begun. But whether it come soon or late, whether it spread with the rapidity of a tidal wave, or whether it reach its culmination only with the slow advance of centuries, I think a man might venture all that he have of faith in this world, upon

the chance—if it be no more than a chance—that therein lies the solution to problems which have vexed the world since the gospel of Christ first began to be preached. “I am the way,” said the Saviour. There is but one way, and when we have found that, when we have discovered a great channel by which the truth may be brought home to the lives of men, then no matter how poor and trivial and unworthy and unclean that way may seem to be, we may rest assured that it is for us of to-day, the voice of the real, the living Christ.

III.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

RELIGIOUS STUDIES IN CHEMICAL SCIENCE.

PROF. ALBERT B. PRESCOTT.

Delivered Feb. 21, 1892.

[JOHN I, 1-10.]

Any studies of created things, made in a distinct recognition of God as their Creator, become religious studies. Religion is defined as "the recognition of God as an object of worship." This definition applies to all religions of all peoples. Among ourselves, in the thought of civilized life, and among college students, whoever acknowledges God admits Him to be the Creator of all. I need not consider any one as having belief in a God who is not a Creator. With us it is, perhaps, the very easiest of the declarations of God, that "all things were made by Him." We believe this if we believe in God at all; without this there is no starting point for our studies.

The recognition of God, in studies of natural objects, imparts to these studies *such degree* of religious character, as is in proportion to the extent in which God is recognized. It is first on the natural side that we admit Him to be the Creator. It is first on the religious side that we acknowledge Him as a being for worship. It follows to fill out our recognition that we know Him as a being for our obedience and our love.

The first four words of the Apostles' Creed state a sufficient qualification to take a course in religious study of science: "I believe in God." The first four words of the English Bible signify the same, "In the beginning God." And when for the

divine name we place the definition given in Webster's Dictionary we have these terms for the full creed we require in the study before us, *I acknowledge God, the Creator, being for worship, obedience, and love.* With this creed we are well prepared to make religious studies in any field of science.

Man's knowledge of things existing below his own mind, so far as this knowledge is systematic and general, constitutes the basis of what are called the sciences. "Physical Science" includes both "physics" and "chemistry." The chemist has made studies of the composition of bodies, and of their transmutation. He inquires into the different kinds of matter, and the nature of the essential difference between one kind of matter and another kind of matter. Chemists have a heavy task in hand. All the matter of the solid globe, of the living things and the atmosphere upon it, indeed all the matter of the universe is before the chemist for analysis. The task was fairly entered upon one hundred and eighteen years ago, and a good deal has been already done towards its completion, but it cannot be said that the chemistry of so much as one drop of water is fully known to any man as yet.

The task of the chemist is rich with many meanings at every step of the way. It is most rich when the hand of God is recognized in all the fashionings of matter, and His truth is seen to be the strength of the sands under our feet.

The subject for this morning has been announced as "Religious Teachings of Chemical Science." In the spirit of this subject let me use another phrase for it, and let me propose, for the time we have together, Religious Studies in Chemical Science. Let us study a little, even a very little of the chemistry of creation, and let us endeavor to do this in the single desire *to learn of the Creator* while we study.

Let us learn, first, that strength and solidity do not lie in matter, as it appears to us. We trust to the iron strands of the suspension bridge to sustain us across the chasm above the merciless cataract, and yet when we drop a wire of the same iron into a certain clear liquid, the metal, owing its strength to the grasp of chemical force, yields to another command of the same power, and, as you see in the test-tube, it dissolves to a liquid as clear as water.

We build a wall of marble, that it shall be strong, but what is marble? Chemical action, with proper liquid, dissolves it, and a part of it becomes a breath, one that boils in the cooling draught at the soda-fountain. The quality of matter shifts and changes with every change in the direction of this force. The marble is solid, and inert to touch and taste. Its molecules cohere perfectly. Each molecule, we say, has an atom of calcium bound by two of oxygen to one of carbon, and to the latter is bound still a third atom of oxygen. Make the marble white hot, and the atom of carbon takes two of the oxygen atoms and becomes the molecule of a vapor. The other oxygen atom cleaves wholly to the calcium, and a new molecule results, a particle of quick-lime, loose and light, biting the tongue, and corroding the flesh.

All the studies of the chemist are made upon transmutations of matter. Professor Kekulé says: "The relations of a body to what it once was, and to that which it may become, form the essential object of chemistry."

The character of matter depends upon the direction of this resistless power, the movements of which, in the innermost of chemical compounds, the chemist can follow but for a part of their way. One of these atoms of oxygen, as we study it, holds the metal with one bond and the carbon with another bond, and

there is good marble. The oxygen turns both its bonds to the metal, and there is crumbling quick-lime. The atom is known only as the center of a certain chemical activity. Deprived of all chemical activity matter must cease to exist in any form known to man. Take away this conserving force and

“The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve.”

What we call the indestructibility of matter, actually is the persisting activity of chemical force.

What we know of the atom of carbon, as it migrates from a compound in the air, to a set of compounds in the green leaf and to a series of unions in the blood of animal life, thence returning again to its first place in the atmosphere, what we know of it is, that it is a center of chemical energy acting in swift response to other chemical centers, with multiplied changes of result. Indeed what we predict of this atom of carbon in the latest hypotheses of stereo-chemistry is but this, a center of chemical force, acting at once in four directions equidistant from each other, so that these lines of action coincide with the four solid angles of a tetrahedron.

As we continue, secondly, to follow the workings of *the forces* which make and unmake matter, the more we study them the farther they lead us beyond visible and tangible objects. Our studies of chemical action lead us to inquire of the supposed ether of physical science.

Consider, if you will, any chemical reaction in the laboratory. In its results it is simple, exact, invariable, true to conditions every time, true in weight and volume and power. But in its causes, it leads us, step by step, to the most ethereal,

and immeasurable existence conceived by science. Not to go to a laboratory, stop and think of that chemical reaction going on before everybody every day on the hearth, the burning of coal. We figure the weight of oxygen to one of carbon true to the second decimal, perhaps to the third. We declare the number of horse-power from one ton of coal, and the load of a running train verifies the rule. Yet when we inquire into the nature of that chemical force whereby one atom of carbon unites with two of oxygen, we are led to predicate something very near to the substance of a spiritual body. When we reach toward the cause of matter we approach the realm of the soul.

The world hears much of evolution, from the studies of the biologist, with a general vague impression, partly true, that mind is developed out of life, and life out of matter. Back of this development and along with it, there is another evolution, shown by the studies of the chemist, that matter is developed out of force, and force is generated by mind. It is a just conclusion that such creative mind is infinite in person, wisdom and love.

This conclusion is derived from studies, thirdly, of the unerring order found in chemical action, and the unvarying beneficence of creation. It is a classical inscription of old world laboratories, "God has ordered all things in exact measure and weight." The periodic harmonies of matter in its chemical structure speak to the mind of the chemist, as the beauties of the face of nature speak to the soul of the artist. Creation is for man in this, that he is capable of hearing its voices.

All the chemical activities render service to man. The fertilizing reactions in the soil, the combinations of food in the living body, the renewing of tissue material in muscle and nerve, the storage of coal and petroleum to do the work of the

artizan, the ministry, or nature under the strivings of art, all are provided to nourish and to instruct the soul of man.

To study the methods of creation, in recognition of the Creator, is to gain religious instruction. This a privilege of the chemical student, whatever be his order of chemical studies. It may be an analytical study, to find what are the parts in combination. The analysis may be qualitative, for the identification of parts, or quantitative, for the ratio of mass of each part. As a masterpiece of literary art may be dissected with gentle care, to find the division lines between groups of the artistic elements, so a proximate analysis may be conducted in the laboratory to reveal the groupings of the atoms within the molecule. As, again, a work of literature may be torn asunder to its ultimate residues by the critic to find only how much of each part has been taken in the composition, so the chemist resorts to the combustion furnace for an ultimate analysis and quantitative results. In any case, whether in literature or in chemistry, it is the highest purpose of the study to show forth the plan of the author. And so when the chemist investigates by a synthetic method, it may be said in a figure of speech that he makes a compound, but it is not really true. It is not he who makes. It is the utmost of the chemist to be a witness of the method in which the compound is made by the Creator, when His forces are liberated through the agency of man. The crystal of a synthetic laboratory product is as much a piece of Divine Creation as can be any crystal found in a grotto just opened by the explorer. The greatest chemical skill cannot alter an atomic mass by any fraction of its weight, nor can it effect so much as the slightest variation in any chemical constant. To be a learner is the utmost of human knowledge. To liberate the creative forces and make way for them is the utmost of

human skill. In synthesis or in analysis, the highest purpose of the student is the same, to find out the order of creation, in "the things that are made." If his spirit be reverent, he may expect to be taught of God.

This is not a claim that all the studies of chemistry shall be directed to religious ends in the distinct sense here intended. There are studies that should be secular, for the times due to the daily life of people. And there are studies that should be sacred, for the interests of immortality.

Still less is this a claim that science, such as chemistry, is a full revelation of God, sufficient for the heart and the life of man. God has spoken "at sundry times and in diverse manners" to his children. All truth leads to God, some truths the more directly.

God's truth as it is in material creation, is in constant reference throughout the bible. When Paul as an evangelist was preaching Christ in terms the soonest to touch the consciences of his hearers he besought them to turn "unto the living God, which made heaven, and the earth, and the sea, and all living things that are therein," quoting from the Psalmist who adds "which keepeth truth forever." All the attributes of God are shown forth in the face of nature. "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the Heavens, and thy faithfulness reacheth into the clouds. Thy righteousness is like the great mountains."

HOW HAS BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH MODIFIED CHRISTIAN CONCEPTIONS?

PROF. V. M. SPALDING.

Delivered February 28, 1892.

The question proposed for our consideration assumes that within recent years Christian conceptions have in some way undergone modification, and that biological study has had more or less to do with this.

If this is true it is a most important fact, for one's conceptions of truth, whether well grounded or not, constitute the truth for him, and the religious conceptions of any person cannot be permanently changed without affecting both character and conduct.

The independent study of such a question, therefore, takes on a deeply serious aspect, and the more so since it can hardly be doubted that some such changes as those assumed are actually taking place, and that, furthermore, one cannot discuss a subject of this kind fully and frankly without in some measure contributing to the very changes of sentiment that, whether to be welcomed or deplored, are, at all events, of momentous consequence.

I should not have proposed to myself such a task as this, but since it has been laid upon me I shall, with a deep sense of responsibility, enter upon it. It must be clearly understood, however, that the elements of the problem are not all given, and that some of the factors involve individual judgment, a

fact that precludes the hope of reaching a conclusion in which all will concur.

It must be said at the outset, that however our conceptions may have changed, Christianity, as a great historical fact, stands absolutely untouched. Our fathers may have held views about it that we cannot accept, and our own views may be equally unacceptable to those who come after us, but this in no wise affects those fundamental and indisputable facts, viz: the life of Jesus Christ on earth, his aim to bring men into nearness and fellowship with God, the marvelous power of Christianity through all the centuries that have intervened, and its purifying and enlightening influence as it exists in the world today. Theorize as we may, accept or reject the non-essential accompaniments that have followed the Christian religion like the camp-followers of a conquering army, mistaken often by the thoughtless for a part of the army itself, we find ourselves face to face with a great historical fact, a gigantic force that, however explained, exists, and makes itself felt today as never before.

Again, no matter how we may seek to explain it, there is such a thing as personal religion. We may or may not have an adequate comprehension of its psychological basis, but those who have sincerely endeavored to come into such a relation to God as Jesus Christ sought to establish, and have felt the impulse to a higher and better life that it gives, have within themselves a knowledge based on actual experience, as real, though possibly as difficult of explanation, as the enjoyment of music by one unacquainted with its theory.

Whatever may be said, then, in what follows, that may in any way appear to conflict with commonly accepted views, the point of departure has been clearly indicated. We proceed

with the distinct recognition of Christianity as an actual historical fact, and personal religion as an actual experience.

The first question to be considered is whether biological study *in itself* tends to weaken religious faith. There is, apparently, a more or less prevalent impression that such is the fact, and it becomes of importance to ascertain, if possible, whether this impression is well grounded.

A great number of individual cases at once present themselves, amply sufficient in my own judgment to show that studies of this nature neither make nor unmake Christian character. Like every other absorbing pursuit, they may, of course, be so conducted as either to develop or repress religious sentiment. One who enters upon a scientific career with a predisposition towards agnosticism is likely to have this strengthened. Dealing constantly with phenomena, accustomed to observe manifestations of life only in connection with matter, the physical and material come to fill his range of vision, and the spiritual becomes more and more alien to his habits of thought. If, on the other hand, his scientific work has been taken up and carried on under the influence of a dominant religious idea, then year by year his study of living things will bring him into more direct relation with the Divine Source of life.

A striking illustration of this is seen in the career of two of the most eminent workers in biological science of the present century, Charles Darwin and Asa Gray. Both were men of unquestioned integrity and extraordinary scientific attainments. In their kindred subject of investigation they were in mutual sympathy, and frequently corresponded with regard to the perplexing questions opened up in their earlier studies of evolution. Yet in their religious views and various other respects they were

totally different. In the latter part of his life Darwin frankly said of himself: "For many years I cannot endure to read a line of poetry.... I have also almost lost my taste for pictures or music.... My mind seems to have become a kind of machine for grinding general laws out of large collections of facts;" and in another connection: "As for a future life, every man must judge for himself between conflicting vague probabilities."

Of Dr. Gray, on the other hand, it has been said, his "was a life in large dimensions. Nature had dealt generously with him, and from none of her gifts and proffers did he turn away." It was in accordance with this larger measure of life that he held in its integrity the Christian faith. In his Yale lectures he said: "I accept Christianity on its own evidence, which I am not here to specify or justify; and I am yet to learn how physical or any other science conflicts with it any more than it conflicts with simple theism."

Cases of this kind, though perhaps presenting less striking contrasts, might be almost indefinitely multiplied. While, then, it is obvious that pre-eminent attainments in science give no assurance of either a religious life or correct apprehension of religious truth, it is certain that they present no obstacle to the highest development of Christian character.

It will be said, however, and apparently with much truth, that here, as elsewhere in human affairs, we have to deal so largely with habit, temperament and will, in other words, the "personal equation" is so prominent a factor, that a comparison of individual cases, however extended, is unlikely to lead to positive results. Our study, accordingly, will now take the form of an inquiry as to whether the fundamental conceptions of Christianity are capable of comparison with those of biological science, and if so, whether they are mutually antagonistic.

How shall we ascertain what is fundamental in Christianity? By comparing the views of Christian people? The question has only to be asked to answer itself. Christian conceptions—so far as they are Christian—must be decided directly from the teachings and practice of the founder of Christianity.

In referring thus to the authority of Christ, I by no means intend to imply that there could not and ought not to be, in the time following his life on earth, any modification in the forms of Christian thought. He seems to have fully understood that there would be such changes and to have desired that there should be. The prediction that those who followed him should do still greater works, directly implies development and growth. He introduced the kingdom of God, taught the elementary lessons, sowed the good seed, and left to his disciples and those who came after them, to care for the growing grain and gather in the harvest. They were to develop forms and methods, and even elaborate into a system the truths he taught or implied. But while freely admitting the singular confidence thus reposed in his followers, and the extraordinary trust committed to them for all the ages, it must be clearly understood and insisted upon that nothing is really Christian that is not in essential harmony with the teachings of Christ. There may well be development, or unfolding, of Christian doctrine, but anything not in accordance with the teaching and mind of the founder of Christianity is unchristian.

Let us, then, as far as the habits of years will permit, uninfluenced, as far as this is possible, by the accumulated interpretations, additions and misconceptions of eighteen Christian centuries, try once more to understand what Christianity really was in the beginning. I assume, for this purpose, the essential genuineness and authenticity of the gospel's, holding as the result

of the most trustworthy scholarship that they tell us enough, and truthfully enough, to enable us to form a clear and substantially accurate mental picture of the life, work and teachings of Christ.

In the first place, then, Christ's conception of God was of a Father. Through life and in death the fatherhood of God was something as real as his own being. Witness his life of prayer. In the presence of the multitude he lifted up his eyes to heaven and blessed the food he gave. In the silence of the night he rose up a great while before day and went into a place apart to pray. His very imagination was filled with the thought. Listen to the parable of the prodigal son. How that most beautiful piece of the literature of all nations and ages embodies the great theme that filled the life of Christ! God the Father of all men, loving and pitiful, not waiting, merely, but reaching out to help and save and forgive.

Now this is the Christian conception of God. Whatever may have been added to it, whatever a relentless logic may have attributed to the Creator of the universe, now or in times past, the fundamental conception of the fatherhood of God is characteristic of Christian modes of thought. "Behold, he prayeth." That meant that the man referred to was a Christian. He was actually approaching God, and asking him for what he needed. The conception and its application is precisely the same today as it was nineteen hundred years ago, and it still serves as a practical test. A Christian regards God as his Father and asks him for help.

Again, there comes to us in the teachings of Christ, like air from the mountains, the conception of righteousness. Listen to the terms of admission into his kingdom. "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and

Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of God.” Hear the interpretation of the law: “Ye have heard that it hath been said.....but I say unto you”—and then came the principle of righteousness, of duty, of truth, in the inward parts. Watch his own application of it in all his life of self-renunciation. “Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.” It was always and everywhere the teaching of Christ that duty, based on loyalty to God, that righteousness is the very foundation of Christian character. And in one form or another, more or less clearly apprehended and expressed, this has been from that time down to the present, the conception of his followers. Obscured in various ways it may have been, but its necessity has always been acknowledged, and even the least consistent of the followers of Christ have freely admitted that of all men they were bound to live the truest and act the best. This deep and abiding sense of obligation has rested on something entirely different from grounds of expediency. The Christian says within himself “I ought,” following the example of Christ, and with loyalty to him, to do this, and the motive has stood the test of fire and the rack. There is, then, a definite Christian conception of righteousness and duty. God grant it may never fail from the earth!

Once more, the founder of Christianity taught unequivocally the doctrine of eternal life, that is, the life of God, that those who will may share with him. There is no more sublime conception of which the human mind is capable. To know Him, “whom to know aright is life eternal,” to share the thoughts of God, to live a part of His life, to feel the assurance that this divine life, whatever else may fail, cannot possibly be blotted out; what more, or what else can the soul of man aspire to? And has any explanation or re-statement ever put it better than

the simple form in which the followers of Christ still receive it —“the gift of God is eternal life”?

But the true measure of all these conceptions is their actual embodiment in tangible form. It has been well said that “Christianity is not a theory but a life,” and our apprehension of it will be far from complete unless we consider one more and a very practical aspect of it.

The most impressively unique feature in the life of Christ was its absolute unselfishness. Looking abroad through the world, and backward through its history, taking in the long record of persistent self-seeking, in the coarse forms of avarice and sensualism, and in the refined forms of modern luxury, we need to keep our eyes steadily on the fact that Jesus of Nazareth not only taught unselfish love of others, but did actually live for others; that this was in great part his gospel, that it was so understood by his disciples; and that there have been ever since his time those who have sacrificed themselves, their own interests, and what men hold most dear, for the sake of doing good to others, and so fulfilling the law of Christ. The fact is worth dwelling on. The spirit of Christ has actually entered into some men. There is such a thing as unselfishness on earth.

Such in barest outline is what appears to me the most essential part of what Jesus Christ lived and taught. Has the onward march of scientific discovery, has the development of philosophical thought in any form affected by so much as a shadow the great central figure of Christianity? Has any one found a defect in the sublime gospel of Christ—I mean his own gospel, as he himself taught it? Has anything come to light that prevents any one of us from being his disciple, learning of him, catching his spirit, doing a part of the work that he began,

and left us to finish? Is there not here something that we know is eternal?

But around this central figure has been built up a system of theology that by perhaps the majority of Christians, and apparently by all who are not such, is still believed to be the Christian faith. It is a most venerable structure. Into it have been built the lives and thoughts, the aspirations, the sacrifices, the martyrdom of men of whom the world was not worthy. It is something not to be lightly thrown into the limbo of forgotten dreams. It is our heritage, let us not forget it, of men who walked with God. Yes, but of *men*! And no work of man has ever stood unchanged through any long period of time.

Turning now very briefly to a consideration of biological science in its present stage of development, we find, precisely as in the study of Christian ideas, that scientific conceptions are based on certain facts. These facts are perfectly obvious to a normal and properly trained mind. They have, it is true, no moral quality. Their belief renders a man neither better nor worse. But as facts they are indisputable. These, as the data of science, correspond, in a certain sense, with the data of the Christian faith. As in the one case, a theological system, so in this, a system known as biological science has been built up. Actual workers in this field of inquiry know very well that the facts are not all in, and that even what are regarded as fundamental conceptions have slowly taken form, and are still subject to modification? Some of these, however, have attained such a degree of probability as to command the assent of those who are familiar with the facts and open to conviction. Of these the theory of evolution is best known, and has had most to do with changes of theological views in recent years.

In its application to the human species, this doctrine

teaches that man, like all other animals, has attained the structure, powers and character he now possesses through successive stages of development. I need not point out how completely at variance with old-time theological ideas this doctrine is. When it was first taking form theologians were not slow to perceive that it involved, as regards the accepted system, very serious consequences, and it is not at all strange that they should have so long, and in some instances, bitterly opposed what has become as well settled as the law of gravitation. For, while the essentials of Christianity have, as I believe, been absolutely untouched by the theory of evolution, it is certain that in its relation to hitherto commonly received theological conceptions, its influence has been in the highest degree destructive, involving, to use Prof. Le Conte's expression, the necessity of a complete reconstruction of Christian theology,

Nothing short of such a frank admission will meet the case. It is neither wise nor right to attempt to demonstrate a harmony that does not exist. It is, as I believe, necessary to begin at the foundation if a consistent theological system is ever to be built up? And such an admission ought to excite no surprise. It is simply saying that theological science, like all other human systems, is necessarily of slow growth, and is subject to the limitations and hindrances that everywhere arise from misconceptions and unwarranted assumptions.

This reconstruction of Christian theology, already begun, calls for high scholarship, a scientific temper, untiring patience and a living faith, if the structure is to stand. Mistakes will inevitably be made, as they have been in the past, but a student of biological science should be the last one to be troubled by this, or to utter a single unkind word as the work is going on. He knows that the history of his own science is a history of

mistakes; mistakes made by the best and most conscientious investigators of one generation, to be corrected by those of the next. He has learned to take no man's word as final. He knows no such thing as infallibility, except in the laws of nature that are the laws of God, and yet he has boundless faith in the fundamental facts and principles from which he is constantly drawing inferences and conclusions.

It is, then, both scientific and Christian to expect mistakes, but to look for their gradual elimination and the final development of a consistent system. It is unscientific and unchristian to interpose a single obstacle in the way of those who, in the face of more than ordinary difficulties, are engaged in the good work of giving consistent form and expression to Christian conceptions.

It is still much too early to attempt to show what the "new theology" will be when the principle of evolution has become more fully understood and its legitimate consequences realized. The task of its development, of course, belongs to theological, not to biological science. But meantime, certain tendencies are so strongly marked that they can hardly escape the least observant. These are doubtless due, in part, to various causes, but it may be safely assumed that evolutionary views have had their full share in inaugurating them.

Of these may be mentioned, first, a marked change of attitude toward the Bible. An increasing number of the most conscientious and intelligent leaders of Christian thought are coming to look upon the Bible simply as the lamp through which the light of God shines, the record of God's revelation of himself to men. Prof. Schurman of Cornell University, says: "I hold the Bible to be a guide to God, though a guide needing re-interpretation with every advance of human knowl-

edge, insight and experience.” Prof. Joseph A. Thayer of Harvard, in a timely contribution to this subject, says: “Facts like these * * * * remind us that the church produced the Bible, not the Bible the church. They may teach us that when we set the book up as the infallible and final appeal in all matters of religious belief and life, we are doing something for which we have no historic warrant; we are assigning it a place and a function which it neither held nor exercised at the outset; which from the known facts of its history it could not possibly have assumed among the primitive believers for generations.” Prof. Otto Pfeleiderer of the University of Berlin, in a recent paper says: “The Scriptures, indeed, can no longer come to us as a collection of oracles, in which every word and letter is of infallible divine authority. We have learned to take account of the human side of them, have learned to estimate the historical circumstances and conditions under which each portion was produced; in short, we look upon the Bible as a book written for men and by men, but full of sublime, holy and divine truth. Its religious value is thereby none the less, its power to awaken faith and strengthen and build up is none the weaker.”

The new and eager study of the Bible that has followed this change of attitude has come to partake largely of genuine research. It is of the very nature of scientific investigation, and so far have the spirit and methods of modern scientific inquiry come to be depended upon that it is safe to believe that they will never be abandoned. As a result, the Bible must inevitably become better known, and its quickening power felt, far more than under the former way of approaching it. Whatever is regarded as an infallible oracle tends directly to encourage indolence and superstition. The search for truth is God’s

ordained means of obtaining it. It is well for Christian men if, even by a rough awakening, they are coming to understand that religious truth forms no exception to the rule.

A tendency closely connected with the preceding, or even growing out of it, is distinctly manifest and unequivocally hopeful. Christian people are beginning to take habitually the attitude of learners. With the realization that all truth requires thoughtfulness and patience for its proper apprehension, that wisdom from above is to be sought "as silver" and "searched for as hidden treasures," a disposition is becoming prevalent that indicates at once a more scientific and a more truly religious frame of mind. It is equally remote from the self-sufficient agnosticism that asserts that man cannot know God, and the complacent presumption that assumes both to know him and to share with him in the direction of the universe. It is content to admit that "we know in part and prophesy in part." It is coming to apprehend the truth that no small part of our religious training consists in the discipline of uncertainty, and that "God's reserve is vastly more edifying to the docile soul than man's dogmatism." The lesson may be a hard one for some of us, but if we have at last found out that we know less than we thought we did of the plans, methods and purposes of Infinite Wisdom, let us be thankful to those who have helped us to see our ignorance. It is the great opportunity of the Christian world to learn a lesson of humility and patience. It is to be hoped that the opportunity will not be lost.

There is, moreover, an unmistakable tendency toward the simplest possible expression of Christian faith. It cannot, I think, be doubted, that formulas and creeds have so far lost their power that they can never again be leaned upon as they have been in the past. While one great and honored branch

of the Christian church is now laborously endeavoring to fit its creed to present modes of thought, a very large number of their fellow-Christians are wondering how they can possibly expect to frame it so that it will last. Plain facts appear to be that no council or ecclesiastical body can ever gain such ascendancy over the minds of men as to command even general assent to the formulas they may propose. This may indicate that we have lost much that in times past has probably served a useful purpose; but it also indicates that we have made an inconceivable gain in attaining something more of the "simplicity that is in Christ."

If the views here presented are truthful, we need not give ourselves undue anxiety about the final outcome. To those who ask: "What is there left?" the answer is: "Everything that is good." The stripping off of traditions has only brought into clearer relief the Divine Presence.

Many, doubtless, of the most conscientious Christians still find themselves in perplexity; yet more than ever before, down in their inmost souls, they long for the presence of God and seek his kingdom and his righteousness. To all such the words of Christ come with deep meaning: "Have faith in God." As if he would say to us today: "Those who were nearest and truest to me during my life on earth constantly mistook and misapprehended. Why have you made so much of the reporter, with his ignorance and prepossessions, and so little of the marvelous Presence that he vainly tried to comprehend and communicate? Rest now from your fruitless toil, from theories and traditions, explanations and contradictions, look beyond the rubbish and the haze, come to me, and I will give you rest. The word of man is ever uncertain. Only God is unchanging. Have faith in God."

GOD AND NATURE.

PROF. H. S. CARHART.

Delivered February 14, 1892.

The relation of God to the material universe is an oft-recurring question and furnishes a field for unlimited and very interesting speculation. Is God immediately present and volitionally active in every display of energy in the natural world about us, or was this energy imparted to the material world at the creation and destined to act on and through nature in the endless transformations of matter and the multiform conversions of physical forces? Does matter continue in existence and do the activities of nature proceed with unvarying uniformity because God sustains the one and continually exerts Himself to bring to pass the other? The answer that we give to these questions determines our philosophy of the world, but does not touch the inquiry into our *moral* relation to the Creator of the universe.

Dr. Samuel Clark, the intimate friend of Newton, wrote as follows: "Matter being evidently ~~not~~ capable of any laws or power whatsoever, any more than ~~it~~ is capable of intelligence, except only this one negative power, that every part of it will be itself always and necessarily continue in that state, whether of rest or motion, wherein it at present is; so that all those things which we commonly say are the effects of the natural powers of matter and laws of motion, of gravitation, attraction, or the like, are indeed (if we will speak strictly and

properly) *the effect of God's acting upon matter continually and every moment*, either immediately by Himself or mediately by some created beings." John Wesley says, "He is the true author of all the motion in the universe. All matter of whatsoever kind is absolutely and totally *inert*. It does not, cannot in any case move itself. . . . Neither the sun, moon, or stars move themselves. *They are moved every moment by the Almighty hand that made them.*" Dr. Cocker in his "Theistic Conception of the World" says: "He is in nature not merely . . . impressing laws upon matter, but . . . the ever present source and ever operating cause of all its phenomena. . . . If by nature we understand the varied forms of energy which underlie the phenomena, these forms of energy are but various modes in which the omnipresent power of God reveals itself. God is immanent in matter, and his *ceaseless energy* produces all the phenomena of nature."

Joseph Cook said in one of his lectures that the reason why we stand in awe of the thunder is because we know that God himself is *just behind the cloud*, hidden from us only by the thin veil of the storm. Professor Bowne says that "a tree has no substantial existence in itself; it is only a temporarily persistent form of divine activity." Professor Bowen writes, "According to the conclusion at which we have now arrived, matter has only a capacity of resisting a change of state; Efficient Cause and Final Cause, by which alone that resistance can be overcome, . . . can be found only in the action of mind."

Respecting these questions we must remark that they are speculative and philosophical ones—not *scientific*; they can never be settled by observation nor tested by experiment, but

will probably remain to be fought over on debatable ground for generations to come. It is of the nature of metaphysical and philosophical discussions that the attainment of settled truth respecting them is impossible.

Again, this philosophy of the direct activity of God in nature has a strong flavor of pantheism. It is God everywhere, in everything—in every moving leaf, every whispering wind, every sailing cloud, every hot sirocco that sweeps over the burning south, every cold wave that pinches and paralyzes the frozen north, every firearm that sends its bullet on a mission either of mercy or of murder, every accident that brings untimely death to scores of human beings, every “pestilence that walketh in darkness,” every “destruction that wasteth at noonday.” If all activities are God immediately acting, then the Deity has in part placed himself at the beck of the assassin as well as the saint, subject to the unhallowed will of every sinner that walks the earth; because saint and sinner exercise physical force, a part of animate nature, in which it is asserted God is immediately active. To such extremes of absurdity are these philosophers brought in order to be consistent in maintaining their primary principles.

Scientists everywhere regard *energy* as an entity as fully as they regard matter as an entity, and hold that its quantity, rightly measured, is as certainly fixed beyond our control, either to create or destroy, as is the quantity of matter. It is no objection to this rule that energy, or the capacity of doing work, is never known apart from matter. Neither is spirit known by us apart from matter. Even the conception of incorporeal spirit is beyond our grasp. The denial of energy as an entity on this ground would lead to an equal denial of spirit as a real existence. Neither is energy a *property* of matter,

because material properties do not pass from one body to another as does energy. Color, hardness, brittleness, etc., can not be passed on from body to body, yet heat passes rapidly by conduction and radiation from mass to mass, and heat is a form of energy. So also energy is transmitted from place to place and from one body to another by means of electricity. A certain amount of energy is employed in uttering these words. The energy of muscular contraction first passes over to that of aerial vibration, which we call sound; these vibrations, variously distributed, pass into the ears of the listener and there cause motions of membrane, bone, liquids, and nerve fiber; others are shivered into minuter motions by impact against the walls of the room, the furniture, the floors—these minuter motions representing energy in the form of heat; finally this energy of heat passes by radiation into space, and no further transformation lies within the range of our perceptions or observations. Is it reasonable and in accordance with sound philosophy to consider this energy, thus darting from matter to matter, and changing its complexion with every leap, as merely a *property* of matter?

One great reason for our belief in the real existence of matter is that we have learned, since the introduction of sensitive balances in chemical analysis, that we can neither create nor destroy one particle of it. It may be made to pass through many physical changes and to enter into myriad chemical combinations; but its amount, as determined by weight, is not abated one jot or one tittle. If Prof. Bowen's tree is merely a temporarily persistent form of divine activity, what is it when it has ceased to live and grow, or when it has been resolved again into its elements? It is a persistent *something* still. What has been said of matter may be said of energy. The

great law of conservation of energy established in modern times teaches us that we have no power to create and none to destroy energy. Even the little that we exercise as muscular strength, and the origin of which we are prone to ascribe to the action of our will, is derived from the fuel that we take into the system as food, in conjunction with the oxygen that we breathe. We no more create it by our will than the engineer creates by his will the energy of the steam in the huge boiler under which glows the burning coal when he opens the throttle and sets the engine running. The persistence of conservation of energy is then quite analogous to the persistence or conservation of matter. It is no more detached from the Creator and self-existent than matter is.

I wind up a spring or weight and leave it to run a clock. The clock runs for a week without attention. I am neither consciously nor unconsciously present in the activity of the clock. The spring or weight is not a *conscious* agent to do work; but there is constant activity with no intelligence present and at work. Motion, planned by intelligence, continues, but not as the result of constant intelligent activity. If the clock becomes deranged it stops, and will not start again without the aid of intelligence to set it in order. But that is peculiar to human inventions and devices; no such limitation of stoppages applies to the regular and orderly motion of the heavenly bodies. So I conceive of the action of forces in nature. God created matter and endowed it with certain remarkable properties, by virtue of which it becomes the vehicle for the manifestation and transmission of energy, which He also created. In consequence of this creation and endowment, every atom and molecule of the physical world is in constant motion. They all appear, moreover, to be endowed with

certain attractions, or at least tendencies toward one another that seem to result from attractions. By reason of these attractions and motions we have the physical world built up of a limited number of elements, combining with one another in almost endless variety. Molecular motion is convertible into visible or mass motion, and mass motion is convertible into molecular motion. Not including miracles in this discussion, because they are not processes subject to our investigation, the processes of nature go forward, in my thought, without any *necessary* interposition of divine power, but simply because matter was originally endowed with certain persistent properties, and the Almighty breathed into it the breath of energy. So in the last analysis all power is derived from the Creator, but the Creator is not therefore present in every motion and activity of nature. It appears to me to lead to palpable absurdity to say that all *causes* are directly *mental* ones ; that matter in itself as divinely constituted, cannot manifest remarkable activities unless mind is actually present in that activity. Professor Bowen says that "the force or active agency by which a stone is moved does not reside in the stick, or even in the hand that pushes it, but in the conscious or intelligent mind or will, which thrusts the hand or stick with a preconceived or definite purpose and a conscious effort." How he could explain the spasmodic muscular contraction of the limbs or other bodily parts in unconsciousness or even in opposition to the conscious effort of the intelligent mind or will, he does not tell us. The ancients furnished an easy way out of the difficulty by ascribing them to demoniacal possessions. His logic appears to be about as follows: Efficient causation can act only *ab extra*, that is, outside of and beyond itself, in producing changes ; matter cannot act on other matter without getting outside of

itself, which is unthinkable ; therefore mind is the only efficient cause. It follows of course that mind acts outside of itself. To establish the latter conclusion and render it intelligible, he enumerates certain functions of the mind in which he conceives it to act outside of itself, without the limitations of time and space. One of these functions is knowledge. We know both the past and the distant ; and so, he continues, the mind extends its field of operations outside of itself, and even goes beyond the limits of the body. "All that is inside the skin," he says, "is also inside of consciousness. I feel not only at my finger tips, but over the whole surface of my body." "I localize a pain as in the head, the knee, or the back, and put my finger at once upon the spot where a mosquito has stung me." These statements are their own refutation. In a philosophical sense we no more feel at our fingertips than we see at infinity when we look at a star.

Prof. Bowen imagines that he sees the action of mind outside of itself even in the simplest act of memory. It sets at naught both time and space in recalling the past. Not merely a picture or mental image of what has been, but the past itself must be actually *present* to consciousness, he says. In deciding that a portrait is a faithful copy or reproduction of the features of a friend, he declares that even the living face of the dead friend must actually be *present to consciousness*. It would seem to be a sufficient answer to such a theory to draw attention to the fact that the mistakes of memory are utterly inexplicable if the past is actually present to consciousness. On the other hand, the greatest diversity exists in the ability of different individuals to form and recall mental images. Some recall a landscape or a street scene only in outline, or with all sharp contrasts shaded down, or with outlines dimly drawn-

Others recall with remarkable vividness and accuracy. Cerebral impressibility is as diverse as is sensitiveness to touch, delicacy of taste, or intellectual apprehension ; and all that the mind can do in memory is to recall an impression already made in the past, and partly obliterated it may be by subsequent impressions and the lapse of time.

Prof. Bowen accepts the doctrine of Descartes, that matter has no inherent dynamical properties, but only a passive capacity of resistance, as manifested by inertia, etc. Hence, he says, when vital or psychical forces are carried over into the inorganic kingdom, they operate not by extinguishing, or even suspending the mechanical properties which are there at home, but simply by overriding their opposition, a greater effort of the psychical force being needed in order to overcome this resistance, and the result produced being properly *compound*, because determined by the joint agency of the force and resistance acting together. It is noticeable that psychical force and the so called passive resistance of matter are here placed on an equal footing, because they enter equally into "compound" result. But force as applied to mind and force as applied to matter are not comparable. The latter has a definite scientific meaning and is capable of exact measurement ; the former is used in a figurative sense. It is entirely inadmissible in our present knowledge of nature to speak of a *psychical* force as producing motion of matter. It is unfortunate that some philosophical writers are not more conversant with the physical sciences, and have not imbibed more of the spirit of modern inquiry into the processes of nature. In illustration of this capital defect, consider Prof. Bowen's argument that gravitation is not a force inherent or immanent in matter. He says : "Any particle of matter, could it be completely isolated, that

is, if it were alone in the universe, would not gravitate at all. Since what is true of any is certainly true of all, it follows that the universe as a whole, with nothing outside of it, does not gravitate; and therefore gravity is not a quality inherent in matter, but must be regarded philosophically as the result of a metaphysical force *situated between* different bodies, not *in* them, and as acting upon them *ab extra*, from the outside." A "metaphysical force" indeed! In the first place, no physicist ever claimed that a body could gravitate toward *nothing*; but it is a matter of commonest observation that bodies do gravitate toward *one another*. Neither was it ever supposed that the universe as a whole, with nothing outside of it, gravitates toward nothingness. It requires at least two bodies to gravitate toward each other; and all the parts of a system gravitate together toward their common center of mass. Hence arise motion and change of motion—the orderly and mathematical progression of the heavenly bodies in accordance with well-known laws. If only one compact body existed in all space, it must either remain eternally at rest, or if moving, its motion must be eternally uniform and in a straight line. And no energy would be expended in keeping it in motion, but it would continue to move because there would be *no force to stop it*. But let it come into proximity with another body, and directly they begin to revolve around their common center of mass, because of their mutual gravitation, whereby both are deflected from an otherwise rectilinear path. Any one who attempts to realize the condition of a body gravitating toward nothing, with no other body in the universe, will be content thereafter to conceive of bodies gravitating toward one another.

Matter was either put in motion at the creation, or per-

haps endowed with the potential energy of attraction whereby motion was generated. Hence result the endless changes of nature, some of which only have been explained. Energy is as persistent as matter, and along or through matter passes from one form to another. Energy was created or imparted as matter was created. Within our limited range we transform energy and matter by taking advantage of their properties or modes of action, which we call *law*. We only direct and furnish the requisite conditions—we create nothing. Not even in the exercise of muscular action do we create any energy in obedience to the command of will ; for all the energy that we can exert by muscular contraction is as fully provided for us and accounted for, by reason of external supplies, as is the power exhibited by a steam-engine or a water-wheel. The hand moves in obedience to the will when the mechanism is all in order, but it is not moved *by* the will as a force.

“ In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,” and there is not the slightest evidence of His having created either matter or energy since. If natural forces are God acting personally, did then the Creator apportion to the material universe at the creation a perfectly definite amount of energy, to which amount He Himself should ever be limited? For no law is more clearly established by a multitude of experiments and dependencies in nature than is the law of conservation of energy, exactly like the law of conservation of matter. I do not understand this law of conservation to exclude God from the direction of earthly affairs for wise purposes. For as we bring about a variety of results by variously combining known laws of nature within the range of our limited powers and knowledge of material operations, without suppressing any forces of nature or calling any new ones into existence, without

suspending any natural law or contravening any natural process ; so the Creator may bring out of natural processes results that would not flow but for his direction and interposition ; not that He thereby amends or abrogates or suspends any natural law, but combines and directs them as man does, only with infinitely greater intelligence and greater knowledge of them, because His knowledge is not fragmentary but *complete*. This view leaves ample room for prayer and does not exclude God from the material universe ; while at the same time it does exclude from our philosophy that pantheistic view of nature that makes God active in every motion and manifestation of energy, that literally “ sees God in the clouds and hears Him in the wind.”

Matter is endowed with certain properties and energy acts according to persistent laws. The question often arises whether this endowment of properties and laws is necessarily as it is, or could it equally well have been otherwise, though perhaps not with equal wisdom ? In discussing this phase of the subject, it is necessary to remember that we really see only externals ; the real causes may be eternally concealed from human understanding. All science is simply an attempt at the unification of natural phenomena by reducing them to general laws of action—to include them within more and more comprehensive theories. It binds or attempts to bind diverse phenomena into a comprehensive and related whole by discovering far-reaching laws, around which the facts of nature are grouped. It marshalls facts in one grand plan, as military science marshalls heterogeneous groups of men—infantry, cavalry, artillery—into one grand army with a single definite purpose. But when the facts of science have been so grouped and explained, we have gone only a single step backward toward

the First Great Cause ; the *mystery* of nature remains still. If we could get back to primal principles, we might find that those once established, all details follow as necessary consequences.

There are certain laws of thought that we cannot conceive as admitting of change. Two and two make four, *necessarily*; the surfaces of spheres, of necessity, vary directly as the squares of their radii. If there is any place in the universe where these mathematical facts are different, certain it is that telescopic vision has not found it in fathoming space ; nay more, we can not even *conceive* of such a state of things. It follows as an equal necessity that all energy, radiating from a center as its source, must vary in intensity as the squares of the distances from that center, provided only that no energy is lost or absorbed in its propagation outward, that is, that the law of conservation is true and no conversion into other forms takes place. If energy should be *annihilated* in its progress outward, then the diminution of intensity would be greater than the law of inverse squares requires. In fact, the intensity or loudness of sound diminishes more rapidly than the law of inverse squares indicates, because there is a slow conversion of the energy of sound-waves into heat.

I conceive of the law of variation of gravitation according to the law of inverse squares as a mathematical necessity, so long as the laws of thought remain as they are in space of these dimensions.

The evidence of science is quite conclusive that the energy of the physical universe, on which life depends, is gradually running away into space. The dissipation of energy is a law demonstrated by every case of the conversion of energy. All forms of energy are slowly assuming that of heat, which is slipping into space as a radiant energy. Thus the great

mechanism of the solar system is surely running down. It has been running without halt for millions of years. This system of ours had a definite beginning in its differentiation from other nebulous masses, and all science points toward an equally definite and certain end, when the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll. This conclusion is unavoidable unless there exists some method of gathering together this scattered energy and focusing it at some new central point, to run again its long shining course. But this cannot happen unless some new order contravenes of which at present we have no knowledge.

Thus we believe that the Creator made matter in the beginning and imparted to it the energy of which He alone is the source and spring ; that He ordained that energy should act upon and through matter according to definite methods which we call laws ; that in accordance with these laws, the present physical systems of the universe, with their orderly arrangements and multitudinous natural processes have been developed. What a sublime view such a scheme gives us of the Creator who so devised the physical universe that he could foresee through millions of future years the exact results of all His plans ! How much more “ worthy of its Divine author than that which would huddle the whole into a few literal days, and convert the incalculably ancient universe which we inhabit into a hastily run-up erection of yesterday.”

“ To him who in the love of nature,
Holds communion with her visible forms,
She speaks a various language.”

He who becomes familiar with her by long years of intercourse, who studies her ways and rightly understands her possibilities, becomes more and more profoundly impressed

with her mysteries and the wealth of her resources. She appears to him to be possessed of infinite possibilities that need only the touch of human genius to waken them into most marvellous activity. He learns no longer to despise matter, endowed as it is with divinely bestowed furnishings, and repels with a feeling akin to personal insult the flippantly bestowed title of "mud," with which some philosophers seek to belittle it. He looks *through* nature *back* to nature's God ; and as he contemplates the endless play of her activities, and calculates the inconceivable sum of her energies ; when he traces backward the thread of her history, and projects into the future the the line of her progress ; when he views her in her totality and beholds the plan of her destiny, his heart swells with emotion, and he is ready to ascribe honor and glory and power to Him who brought matter and energy into being, and set them running in their courses down the grooves of time.

THE METHODS OF SCIENCE APPLIED TO CHRISTIANITY.

PROF. W. J. HERDMAN.

Delivered May 14, 1893.

True science and pure Christianity have never antagonized each other. Conflicts between "science so called" and sound Christian beliefs, as well as between perverted Christian doctrine and truth revealed in material phenomena, or in the mental and moral nature of man, have frequently occurred and are of necessity inevitable.

Truth is a unity, and when properly apprehended in one department of the universe, is found to harmonize with the truth in every other.

This belief is the underlying unity and harmony of things which at first present themselves in such apparent diversity, is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and the foundation upon which all science, of whatever sort, has been reared.

John, in his introduction to his Gospel, states the relationship of the founder of Christianity to all truth, showing him to be the germ from which all that the human understanding has grasped and recognized as truth, has been evolved.

"In the beginning was the Word,
And the Word was with God
And the Word was God,

The same was in the beginning with God.

All things were made by Him,

And without Him was not anything

Made that was made."

Previous to the Advent of Christianity, science had no sure foothold. This came only when by slow degrees the idea of *One God* "by Whom all things were created that are in Heaven and in earth visible and invisible," became thoroughly interwoven with the texture of the human mind.

Science presupposes and rests on this oneness and uniformity of the universe, and "this idea is, strictly speaking, a Christian conception." It is more than a coincidence that the growth of Christianity and the development of the sciences have advanced with equal step. A mutual helpfulness has marked their progress, each having made more rapid conquests by the other's aid. Whenever Christianity has produced its best fruits, there science has flourished in greatest luxuriance. A real antagonism beginning far back in the centuries, would not have so resulted.

No religion of human origin could have formulated doctrines so comprehensive and far-reaching. The founder of Christianity "spake as never man spake." A young man of humble parentage, untaught by the noted scholars of the day, with meager opportunity for associating with the wise and learned, with three years of peripatetic teaching gave to the world buds of truth, which in their unfolding are found not only to accord with the revelations of the nineteen centuries of human progress, but have furnished the light and the motive power by which such progress has been made possible. What other religion known to history can be shown to meet the requirements of the physical, mental, moral and

spiritual nature of man and stimulate each and all toward a perfect and harmonious development?

Detached and disjointed excellencies in sculpture, painting, architecture, engineering, and in philosophy and in ethics, have been the product of scientific methods under many of the ancient pagan civilizations, but a pantheistic or polytheistic conception of the origin and maintainance of the universe furnished no key wherewith to unlock the mysteries of nature and discover the unity and harmony that reigned within. If, then it is true that modern science is in a certain sense the offspring of Christianity, it is but natural to assume that the greatness of the child would reflect honor upon the parent, and that whatever excellencies the former is found to possess, they are but the necessary consequences, the natural expansion, the gradual evolution and expression, of what the latter contained from the beginning. The mysteries of the germ are revealed by its development, and its dignity is determined by the greatness and nature of its product.

Truth, as discovered by science, and truth, as revealed in Christianity, can have no conflict, neither are they at variance, but, from this conception of their relationship, they must harmonize with and elucidate each other.

The search-light of scientific discovery turned upon the teachings of Christianity, need bring no fears to the heart of him who has found in their teachings nourishment for his hungry soul, but rather he should welcome it as the seed sown in good soil welcomes the sunlight, by the aid of which its powers are quickened and it springs forth into newness of life and greater usefulness.

Let us now inquire, what are scientific methods and what is the essence, the germ of Christianity, that we may have

clearly in mind what we mean when we speak of applying the one to the other.

“ The one quality above all others which is characteristic of scientific work, which science demands, and which advances with the advance of science, is *exactness*, and exactness is nothing but the discrimination and exclusion of small differences.” Again, “ weighing and measuring are at the root of all science, and no branch of knowledge is entitled to be called a science until means have been devised for measuring its subject matter, and every advance in science is an advance in accuracy of measurement.” But for accuracy of measurement we must have an absolute and unvarying standard to which all measurements are referred. A progress toward accuracy and precision is not effected by a comparison of the unknown and undetermined with each other, but a comparison of the unknown with the positively known. In the infancy of the physical sciences the standards of time, weight and measure had no uniformity, were crude in nature and arbitrarily chosen; the running sand, the stone of the wayside and the outstretched hand served the purpose well enough until the child of nature having become the student of nature, must needs look for a time-piece, a measuring-rod and balance which were fitted to the magnitude of the task he had assumed and which would win from all mankind a universal sanction in their attempts to solve the mysteries of earth and sky and sea.

The universality and immutability of the forms and movements of the heavenly bodies, and the force of gravitation furnished the observer with standards of universal range of application to all objects of sense, and from these sources the electric chronometer, the meter and the chemical balance

have been evolved. The Creator is His own interpreter. He "who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and meted out Heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance," requires of those who would know the marvelous wonders of His works, that they adopt the methods that He himself established, in constructing the foundations of the material universe before it had pleased Him to make man after His own image.

But the phenomena of matter apprehended by the senses are not the only data upon which this exactness of observation may be brought to bear. Scientific methods, as here defined, have been and are as rigidly applied to the phenomena of mind and soul as to the phenomena of matter. There is a mistaken idea in the minds of some that the things of sense are alone the legitimate objects for the exercise of these operations.

"The scientific method is essentially summed up in three words, observation, hypothesis, verification," and if we wish to include the whole materials of knowledge within the field of observation, self-observation must be admitted alongside of world-observation and be submitted with equal impartiality to the test of hypothesis and verification. Facts within man and facts without ; phenomena pertaining to the considering mind as well as to the object considered, are alike capable of being subjected to methods of exact analysis, comparison and demonstration.

The conduct of man when subjected to critical and exact observation is an experimental test of the forces that are operating upon and within him. His manner of response to these forces determines what manner of man he is. The standards of weight and measurement by which the observer makes his

test in forming his estimate of another's conduct depends upon the progress he himself has made in meeting and comprehending the complex elements in human nature. His standards must be sufficiently comprehensive and capable of universal application, or else he has not reached the position where he is entitled to speak with authority in this field of scientific observation. One cannot expect to arrive at truth in the department of ethics, philosophy or religion while overlooking or wilfully ignoring some essential factor in the problem under consideration any more than he can reach correct conclusions in his chemical analysis or his physiological experiment when attended by similar carelessness. A perfect standard for comparison and a comprehensive recognition of all the elements in the problem, together with a rigid adherence to the rules of scientific experimentation are quite as essential to the progress of religion as of science.

What, now, is Christianity? When we study it in comparison with the best of the religions that preceded or were contemporaneous with it, we find that it is not of man's devising. It is more than a system of ethics or philosophy, clothed in rites and ceremonies which appeal to the fears, awaken awe and operate through the superstitions which they are calculated to create and foster.

“ Christianity claims to be no mere social revolution or natural step in the march of human progress. It is a religion whose sources are not to be found within man's nature, but outside of it, in the saving revelation of God in Christ, and Jesus is thus the author and giver of an Eternal life, which spreads itself and is maintained, not by mechanical contrivance, but by the living spirit of God entering into human history and building on the basis of reconciliation a kingdom

of God, which is both human and divine, and which comes and comes again in wave after wave of developing completion, until the will of God is done on earth as in Heaven.” “Christianity is not, then, a thing or a speculation, but a *life*; not a philosophy of life, but a life and a living process;” a living germ, which, becoming implanted in the soul of man, has a transforming power and a regenerating influence which makes him a new creature, causing the manifestations of his life to follow after a different order from those which preceded its development within him. In the light of Christianity, the Old Testament record is a history of the preparation of the mind of man for the coming of Christ. He came not to destroy, but to fulfill what had been promised. Christianity declares that man, the last of all animal creation, was fashioned in the image of his Maker. He, of his own free will, fell from this high estate. Still possessed of a dual nature, body and soul, perishable and imperishable, he cannot, by any power of his own, regain his lost inheritance after having once chosen wilfully to obey the dictates of his fleshly desires rather than the voice of his Creator. Still a prey to the impulses of his lower nature, he is subject to the laws which govern organism and matter of which it is composed. His soul languishes for lack of nourishment. His body goes down to death in the midst of suffering and sorrow and his spiritual part will be forever cut off from all fellowship with the blessed unless some power greater than his own and akin to the Maker who formed it, should quicken and renew its feeble life.

Here is the opportunity for the Son of God, and in the “ripeness of time” he came, fulfilling the Old Testament prophecies. And the New Testament still further declares that the long-expected Messiah took upon himself a human

body, that he was born of the Virgin Mary, in a lowly estate, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried. The third day he rose again from the dead. He ascended into Heaven in the sight of many witnesses. And He himself has declared that this suffering and sacrifice was necessary for the redemption of mankind ; that by His being lifted up upon the cross He would draw all men unto Him.

This, then, is Christianity—the embodiment of a sinless life, and that life the standard for our measurements. The Divine life submitting to human conditions, and voluntarily sacrificing itself to human hate for human need, showed forth the love of God to man. And by the acceptance of this sacrifice and the renewing power of that love, man's spiritual nature is again gradually conformed to the image of its Creator and assumes control of all his faculties.

How, now, can scientific methods, which have been the means of contributing so much to man's physical nature, be made to advance his spiritual needs? If Christianity embraces the plan of man's spiritual development, would it not be profitable to inquire whether or not such methods might not be made use of to extend and accelerate this process?

By way of sanctioning this suggestion let me first remind you of the fact that Christ Himself made use of the scientific method of experimental demonstration in His teaching. To accomplish the purpose of His ministry it was necessary that He give unmistakable evidence of His divine origin. In verification of the hypothesis that He was the creator of all things—that the world and all it contains was made by Him, He must demonstrate in a convincing manner His power to control the forces of nature. This demonstrative proof covers, among others, within the sphere of physical phenomena, His power to

control the winds and the waves, the creation of matter, the transformation of matter and the suspension of the force of gravitation. In the realm of vital force in vegetable organisms, His power was shown by the fig tree instantly withering that received His curse ; while in animal organism the most liberal exhibits of His power and His compassion also, were given in response to the appeals of diseased and maimed humanity. Even the dead sprang to life again at the word of His command. The frequent restoration of the disordered mind showed the intellectual faculties subject to His will. Only in rare instances did He venture to exercise the highest attributes of deity in the direct bestowment of *spiritual* blessings, and in the one notable instance where He said to the bedridden and palsied man, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," it may be with due reverence suggested, in the light of the completed narrative, that the impossibility of giving ocular proof of His power in spiritual things, as was his custom at all times when possible in other things, caused Him to refrain from their more frequent public bestowal.

When John sent to Him the inquiry : "Art thou He that should come or do we look for another?" Jesus referred the messengers to the evidences of their own senses for their reply, and said in substance :

You have heard the dumb speak,

You have seen the blind restored to sight,

You have seen the lame walk, the lepers cleansed and the dead raised to life and you have heard the gospel preached to the poor. John knows what has been prophesied concerning me. This will convince him of its fulfillment.

He did not, after the manner of imposters, seek a cred-

ulous and ignorant audience. In stilling the tempestuous waves and the boisterous winds ; in directing the casting of the nets for the marvelous draught of fishes, He was not surrounded by witnesses unfamiliar with the scenes and the conditions where these miracles were enacted. He demonstrated his power in the presence of experts—skilled boatmen and trained fishermen, whose experience had taught them the limits of human capacity in their special fields of action and fitted them to judge whether these results were natural or the products of superhuman power.

What could be more convincing as an object lesson in proof of divine power or more perfectly illustrate the scientific experimental method in demonstration than the feeding of thousands, faint with hunger, in a desert place, far removed from all sources from which food could be obtained, with but a morsel which was thought by His disciples hardly sufficient to meet their own necessities? Seemingly to avoid all possibility of error in the interpretation of the demonstration and to impress a lesson of economy as well, He directed the fragments to be taken up and they were found to be many times in excess of the original supply and yet all had eaten until satisfied.

Could thousands have been deceived as to the cravings of hunger?—or hungering, could they have had the pangs allayed with aught else than natural food? Like the control experiments of the physiologist or pathologist, the twelve baskets of fragments furnished, then, as it would now, irrefragable proof of the genuineness of the demonstration and the accuracy of the result.

The testimony of the senses again receives its sanction at His hands when, in proof of his resurrection, and without

rebuke, He calls the doubting Thomas to His side, in the presence of many witnesses, and bids him satisfy himself, by sight and touch, that what he beheld was not a vision but the self same body that had received the spear-thrust and the nails. But since modern science, as has been said, owes its very existence to Christianity, it should be a matter of no surprise to find abundant proof that its founder has everywhere exemplified its methods in his teaching.

In no small measure it may be said has science, in these latter years, cancelled the indebtedness which it owes to Christianity by the discoveries it has made, which have so notably confirmed the accuracy of Old and New Testament records. Through the labors of the archæologist and the philologist, the engineer, the physicist and the photographer, ancient cities have been unearthed, inscriptions restored, hieroglyphics interpreted, mummies and manuscripts discovered which have given new and valuable confirmation to the simple narratives of Moses and the four evangelists. Scientific methods applied to these researches have been fruitful in good results and in the interests of truth should be encouraged and applauded on every hand. Faithful research for historical evidences will not imperil the essential doctrines of Christianity. Even the so-called "higher criticism" can do no harm, but, on the contrary, nothing but good when rightly comprehended. And it would be well for the apprehensive to recall, before they wield the cudgel of defense too vigorously, the wisdom of Gamaliel when he said, "Refrain from these men and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of *men*, it will come to naught, but if it come of God ye cannot overthrow it."

If Christianity is a life-process, designed to meet the

needs of man's spiritual nature, in submitting it to a test of its claims by the methods known to science, after all external evidence of its genuineness has been settled or made sufficiently sure, we must scrutinize the internal evidence or what it has to offer in its operation on the conduct of man himself when subjected to its influence. In starting on this investigation the observer must first acquaint himself with the nature of man ; how he deports himself in his environment, what is the range of his activities, and how he responds to all influences brought to bear upon him, lacking only the regenerating influence which is claimed to be derived from God through Christ, It is a legitimate scientific proposition and one which must be met by the advocates of Christianity, that if any cause, other than that which they assume, can be chosen to account for the phenomena of man's action at all times the value of the Christian life as a transforming power is nullified.

Science may turn to historical evidences in its attempt to get a solution of this question according to its methods, or it may look about and gather its evidence from the men and women now living and apply its tests to the conduct which they manifest as adherents or non-adherents of the Christian faith. Whether it will or not, Christianity cannot escape the test. It is in daily and hourly application. Its historical evidences as they have been registered in the lives of men, women and children during the past eighteen and a half centuries, are open to inspection, and the life of every professing Christian is on the witness stand testifying to the truth or falsity of the doctrines of Christ, and to the degree to which the influence of those doctrines is affecting his own life.

As to the evidence from human lives in support of the

uniqueness and genuineness of this life the Christian need have no fears.

When we recur to history and call the roll of the noble army of martyrs and pass in review how frail women and young maidens, old men and children and youth in the full vigor of life, endured mockings and scourgings, bonds and imprisonment; how they were stoned and sawn asunder, tempted and slain with the sword; were forced to wander about outcast, in sheepskins and goatskins, in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth, destitute, afflicted and tormented, all for the sake of loyalty to *Him* whose life had entered into theirs, and had taught them to count the sufferings of this life as nothing compared to the joy which was revealed, as in store for them that love Him; and when the scientific observer looks about him on every hand and beholds the doctrines of Christ directing human activity to the construction of cathedrals and asylums, churches and hospitals; and when he learns of the millions of money that is accumulated and expended in carrying the gospel of Christ to the remotest corners of the earth; and when, upon closer observation of the conduct of those about him who have felt the transforming power of this life upon their own, he sees that it is able to disrupt the closest family ties, and counteract the deepest affections of the human heart, that it robs ordinary self-interest of its motive power, and is capable of making any sacrifice that will secure another's good, and yet that such a life is attended by unmistakable evidence of the possession of a *peace* and *joy* which the world can neither give nor comprehend, he cannot but conclude that he has witnessed the operation of a force of a higher order than that which actuates the human heart without the realm of Christianity. Science,

if it is true to its methods in dealing with all phenomena that can be brought within its range and be subjected to its scrutiny, is challenged for an interpretation of these results so contrary to the natural manifestation of human nature. With her exactness in weighing and measuring the forces of nature, she must account for this disturbing influence, this transforming power on the nature of man which shows itself capable of turning the stream of selfishness into channels of benevolence, changing vengeance into forgiveness, and hatred to love; phenomena which the world had never seen exhibited in human conduct previous to the advent of Christ. But in the demonstration of the phenomena of a "life-process" according to scientific methods, the "crucial test" is *self-inoculation*, and this the founder of Christianity has Himself declared to be the real avenue by which to approach the truth to be revealed in this field of investigation.

"I am the Light of the World; he that *followeth me* shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light of life.—*John 8:12.*

"If any man *shall do His will* he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself."—*John 7:17.*

"If ye *continue in my word* then ye are my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."—*John 8:31-32.*

It is contrary to all rules of scientific experimentation to vary the rules laid down by the author of a method in attempts to verify his results. It is unjust to him, and the motive which actuates it is either a desire to throw doubt upon his conclusions, or a lazy interest in the result to be secured.

A desire to get at the truth, is at the foundation of all

knowledge. The desire is sometimes lacking for fear the truth may prove unacceptable when revealed. That scientist may be justly charged with disloyalty to his methods, if, when the truth is made known thereby, in any department of human knowledge within the scope of his investigation, he declines to accept it. In pursuing investigations regarding Christianity, the scientist is not asked to depart from the methods that have served him so well in his researches among material things, but in entering into the laboratory of another experimenter, for the purpose of testing the accuracy of his results, it is but fair to require that he recognize the scope and nature of the phenomena with which he has to deal, and the standards of weight and measurement by which they must be tested, and, moreover, before he pronounce adversely, that he submit to the final test of *self-inoculation* by which alone, according to the word of Him who introduced the plan of salvation for the spiritual regeneration of mankind, its truth can be verified.

And in closing, I wish to emphasize the notable fact that among the many millions who have made this test, in sincerity, during the many ages that have passed into history since it was introduced, there is yet to appear man, woman or child, to raise a voice and protest that the Christian plan of salvation is either inadequate or untrue.

IV.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

THE EXPANDING POWER OF CHRISTIANITY.

PRESIDENT JAMES B. ANGELL.

Delivered October 9, 1892.

I know some young men who think the hearty acceptance of Christianity would set certain limitations to their development and growth, would in some way fetter their power and influence, would somehow preclude the attainment of the highest type of manhood. I have heretofore, in the presence of some of you, discussed the relationship of Christianity and freedom, and have shown, I think, that true liberty is attainable only by conforming to wise and just law, that regulated liberty is the only true liberty, that any other liberty is license, which is at once destructive and suicidal, that it is ruinous to society, and that it calls down on itself the penalties of self-vindicating laws, that the old liturgy expresses a profound truth when it utters the prayer, "O Thou in whose service is perfect freedom."

I desire now to show that the way to make the most of one's self, to develop not only the finest quality but the largest quantity of manhood, is to give hearty acceptance to Christian truth. In other words, I wish to ask you to consider with me The Expanding Power of Christianity on the Intellectual and the Moral Force of Man.

I. Let us see how Christian truth tends to expand the intellectual powers. It does this by presenting great truths to the mind. The mind grows, if at all, by the apprehension and

assimilation of truths. This is the method by which the child's mind is developed. It is fed and nourished by truths welling up from the fountain of intuitions within or streaming in through the channels of the senses from without. Could we cut off the supply from those two sources, the child's mind would remain undeveloped and infantile. Every truth dropped into the mind of the race has this expanding power. Newton conferred a great benefit on the race by discovering and proclaiming the law of gravitation because of the utility, in the arts, of acquaintance with the law. But he thereby conferred a much greater benefit through the quickening and enlarging power of such a truth, which started so many minds on ten thousand voyages of successful exploration and research. To say that the mind grows by feeding on truth is only another way of saying that it grows by perceiving the mode of God's working in the material or in the spiritual world.

Now Christianity reveals to us the grandest truths we can grasp. Let us notice two or three by way of illustration.

1. It gives us the true idea of God, the grandest truth which the mind can possibly take up. I do not say that the unaided mind can get no idea of God, though some profound thinkers believe that. I think theistic belief may be reached without revelation. But how vague and dim is the vision which is gained! How unsatisfying to our longings! It is questioned by many whether the mind unhelped could reach the idea that God is a beneficent moral governor of the universe; so limited is the range of our view of his operations in the material and in the spiritual world. But the Scriptures reveal him to us as a personal Being, self-determined, not bound, like Zeus, in the fetters of blind Fate; infinite in power and wisdom and justice and goodness; the Creator of

the worlds and all that in them is, existing before the mountains were brought forth or ever the earth was formed, from everlasting to everlasting, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, without variableness or shadow of turning ; and better still, they reveal him to us as the loving Father of us all, yearning for our love with infinite compassion, taking us up when father and mother forsake us ; though marshalling all worlds, yet hearing the faintest cry of his weakest child and noting the fall of the sparrow to the ground. Here is the grandest thought the mind can think. The Science of God, Theology, if we take the term in its literal sense, is the sublimest of all sciences. If we take it in its large and implicit sense as denoting the methods of God's working in His world, it comprehends and enfolds all sciences, all knowledges, all wisdoms, as the sky enfolds and encompasses the earth.

2. Or we may look at the plan of redemption. I do not care to discuss any theory of the atonement. It is sufficient for my purpose to call attention to two great facts: first, that, as all concede, men are in disharmony, mal-adjustment with God, in alienation and estrangement from Him ; and, secondly, that He longs to bring them back, that He has so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son that whosoever believes in Him may have everlasting life, that herein is love, not that we first loved Him but that He first loved us while we were yet enemies to Him. This is the great central fact in the life of the race. Some of the best thinkers have agreed that even the secular history of the race should be written from Calvary as the point of outlook. What a truth is redemption for the mind to take up and nourish itself on !

3. Or if more specifically we turn to the life of Christ, what do we find ? A cloud of mystery broods over the begin-

ning, a flash or two of light is flung upon the childhood, then follows a long period of seclusion and quietude in the carpenter's home. Suddenly this man emerges from obscurity upon the life of Judæa with a magnetic power, which draws after him thousands, who hang entranced upon his lips. He wields an equal and a marvellous power alike over the forces of nature and over the hearts of men. He goes about doing good, unstopping the deaf ears, unloosing the dumb tongues, unsealing the blind eyes, cleansing the lepers, and above all preaching His glad gospel to the poor. He raises the dead to life. He seeks out the most forlorn outcasts, and speaks peace to their souls, even speaks forgiveness to their sins, while at the same time he scorches and smites with the lightnings of His holy maledictions those whited sepulchres, the scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites. He breathes into the Mosaic law, which the doctors had changed into a stiffened corpse, the spirit of sweetness and makes it a living thing again. Though by the waving of his hand he could summon legions of angels to his aid, he goes meekly and alone to the cross, he bears the hiding of his Father's face, and all this for you and me ; he bursts the bars of death and rises triumphant to the side of his Father. The loving care of his disciples gathered up a few of his words, and those words so few that they can easily be printed on one side of one of our metropolitan morning newspapers, so simple that a child can linger over them with appreciative delight, and yet so profound that eighteen hundred years study of them by the best thinkers of the world has not exhausted or fathomed them. Those words so few contain the solution of the gravest problems of life, with which the Aristotles and Platos and Zenos had striven in vain ; they carry the key to all wise and noble and successful living ; they have

changed the whole stream of history ; they have in them the seeds of all that is best in what we proudly call our civilization ; they are destined to work out the regeneration of the world from pole to pole and from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. You are often advised to read the biographies of great men for your instruction. Here is the biography of biographies, the life of lives. It contains within it all that is noblest and sweetest in all other lives, and how infinitely much besides !

And in respect to all this truth which Christianity presents, mark that we can never outgrow it, no matter how far we advance in our acquisitions. God ever has some new truth before us to incite us to new quests. When we have conquered one little field, He draws aside a veil and shows us another ripe for the harvest, and bids us thrust in our sickles and delight our hearts with the golden reward. We may believe that so it will be in Heaven, that “ hills on hills and Alps on Alps arise ” to stimulate us to the ever fresh pursuit of new truth. If we could suppose our hearts untouched by these truths, which God presents, it is clear that merely as an intellectual nourishment and stimulus nothing could be compared to Christianity. No knowledge of earthly tongues, no science of the material universe, could be likened in grandeur and expanding power to this science of God, to this highest ethical and spiritual truth. It bears the mind in its flight far beyond the outermost walls of the visible and material universe into the unbounded region of spiritual and infinite truth.

II. Let us see how Christianity increases our intelligence and moral force by the duties it enjoins, and especially by the spirit in which it commends and commands them.

In immediate connection with the idea just considered we

may notice that the scripture implicitly, if not explicitly, enforces the duty of learning all we can of God's methods ; in other words, of cultivating our intelligence. So that an indolent christian scholar, or an ignorant christian man, if the ignorance is voluntary, are paradoxes. The indolence and ignorance mar the symmetry and subtract from the perfection of Christian character. Wherever Christianity has had a pure development schools and colleges have sprung up in its path.

2. It enjoins the cultivation of all the virtues and tempers which belong to the highest type of character. It includes the virtues of chastity, honesty, purity, self-control, which all agree are the conditions of the best development of the body and the mind. These indeed are taught by many systems of philosophy, notably by the Stoical. But there are also distinctively Christian virtues. We may take for illustration the conspicuous one of self-sacrifice, not in the sense of blind submission to fate, but of a loving surrender to God, which leads men to work for highest ends in a Christlike spirit.

3. It is in the spirit with which Christianity brings us to duty that its highest destination is found. The old systems brought the reluctant soul to duty, as it were, by a dead lift on the conscience, by main strength. Christianity finds the motive to duty largely in love to God and to man. Other systems make duty largely negative, Christianity makes it positive. Even the Mosaic dispensation was largely prohibitory. Eight of the ten commandments were negative, *thou shalt not*. Men were on so low a moral plane that they needed to have hedges and fences of prohibition set up before them, and they were driven like a herd to their destination. Now Christianity fills the heart with love to God and love to man as the grand mo-

tive to all action. When one is thus possessed, one is willing to run with glad heart and willing feet on all Divine errands, counting it all honor to be reckoned worthy even to suffer for the Master. Duty is translated into privilege, into opportunity. Prohibitions and the need of them fall away. All hard reluctances are melted down in the crucible of love. All is positive, joyous, spontaneous, vital. This is the Christian idea of duty. It may be questioned whether in Heaven the word duty may not be dropped from the vocabulary as superfluous.

III. Christianity has an expanding power by virtue of the inspirations and hopes which it kindles. These are as wings to the soul on which it mounts up and flies.

1. The first of these I will name is faith. By faith here I mean that perfect confidence and trust in God which leads to docility and joy in doing the divine will. It is an immense power. The man who possesses it is not deterred from going on with his work by the clouds which gather dark above him. He believes that through the parting clouds God's face will yet shine down upon his path. If adversity and disappointment come to him, he remembers that whom God loveth he chasteneth. If obstacles are piled up in his path, he hurls himself upon them with the mighty power of a heart at peace with God and of a will in harmony with the divine will, and down they go with a crash, for after the divine will there is no such other power in the universe. The most trivial duties are work for God, and are exalted and sanctified into the beauty of an offering to Him.

2. The hope of immortal life revealed to us is another of these inspirations. We all know what a shadow rested on the earth in classic days because of the gloomy forebodings of the

future. But when Christ burst the bars of death, he poured a new light through the darkness of the grave and brought life and immortality to light. From that day, the man who could take to himself the blessed words that he is an heir of God and a joint heir with Christ to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, goes to his work with melodies sounding in his heart which accord with those within the gates of Heaven. This hope glorifies all life.

3. The love of man which Christianity cherishes is another inspiration. I speak of it here as a working power. We all know that it is to Christianity that we owe the idea of the brotherhood of man in its fulness. In the ancient nations a foreigner was a barbarian. The stranger who set foot in the forum of Rome was a slave. It was not till Peter, himself instructed by the vision of the sheet, taught the Jews that the middle wall of partition between them and the Gentiles must go down, it was not until on Mars Hill Paul thundered in the ears of the Greeks the great truth that of one blood God has made all the nations of the earth, that the idea of human brotherhood gained a foothold in the race. But when men came to see that God loved all his children alike, that all are made in his image, that Christ has died for all, that we should never despair of bringing out the image of the Master even in the slave or the sot, then it was that men were invited to go to the ends of the earth to preach the gospel to all nations. Therefore it is that to-day when the cry of the child suffering from famine on the distant Ganges, the child we have never seen and never shall see, rises upon the air and pierces our ears here in Michigan, Michigan gold and Michigan wheat, if need be, go across the ocean to relieve the sufferer. Nay, even pagan nations have felt the power of this Christian idea, and

so the heavy gates of China and Japan, which from time immemorial were closed against the world, are now swinging slowly open on their hinges, creaking with the rust of so many centuries.

IV. What education then is there like this Christian truth stretching the mind to its utmost capacity, filling it till it runs over with all it can take of the knowledge of God, of His modes of work, of his relation to us, disciplining the heart with all blessed tempers till it grows normally toward God, inspiring it with all highest hopes and most stimulating impulses and noblest enthusiasms of faith, of immortal joy, of love to man.

How many souls has it thus enlarged ! How it expanded the narrow, passionate, illiterate Peter till from an ignorant fisherman he grew to be the chief preacher of the twelve ! He stirs us with his bold and masculine eloquence to-day as he thrilled his audience in the pentecostal day. How this Christian spirit changed the bigoted, prejudiced, persecuting Saul of Tarsus into the great broad-horizoned Paul, whose intellectual and moral power has swayed the world as no other man's has. And how many others there are of lesser fame, nay of absolutely obscure lives, to whom this gospel has been equally an enlarging and saving power !

What now will you do with your lives ? Will you not strive to enlarge your minds and your souls by aid of these divine helps which have been furnished to you ? This Association stands with open hands and hospitable hearts to welcome all newcomers, and to assist them in securing the largest spiritual growth. Never will you, my young friends, who are just beginning University life, find yourselves in circumstances more propitious for insuring spiritual growth. Here you are

surrounded with a great company of friends, who have the same pursuits, the same trials, the same tastes as you have. Sympathy is here ever quick and ready. You need not travel alone in the heavenly way, but you may enjoy the society of those who from experience know the difficulties that are to beset you and the joys that are within your reach. They cordially invite you to cast in your fortunes with them, and in their companionship to seek after the expanding power of the Christian truth and the Christian life.

A PEDAGOGICAL VIEW OF SOME NEW TESTAMENT SERMONS.

PROF. B. A. HINSDALE.

Delivered March 19, 1893.

For though I was free from all men, I brought myself under bondage to all, that I might gain the more. And to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak: I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some. —1 Cor. ix:19-20.

The New Testament writers constantly keep two things separate and distinct, that we constantly tend to confuse. They are preaching and teaching.

The word *kerux*, found in the Testament three times, means a herald, a public messenger, an ambassador. The word *kerusso*, found sixty times, means to act as a herald, to make proclamation, to announce publicly, or proclaim some message, generally of a more or less public or official character. *Kerugma*, used eight times, signifies what is heralded, cried, or proclaimed. These are the words that are rendered “preacher,” “preach,” and “preaching” in the English Testament. They set before us the preaching function in the strongest manner. *Kerux* and *kerusso* harmonize admirably with *kerugma*, considered as the

Gospel, or the Good Tidings. Perhaps the composition of the New Testament, and the naming of written documents Gospels, tended somewhat to dull the edge of the original ideas. It is at least well to remember the fact stated by a distinguished Biblical scholar, "that all the expressions employed in the New Testament to distinguish the proclamation of the new truth, set aside the notion of written documents. The Gospel was at first nothing but the proclamation of the good news of pardon flying from mouth to mouth."

No passage better brings out the force of the word "preach" than the prophecy of Isaiah that Jesus applied to himself.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because He annointed me to preach good tidings to the poor:
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

The Greek *didaskalos* was a teacher. In the Gospels the word is applied to Jesus nearly fifty times, and is commonly translated *Master*. *Didasko*, which is found even more frequently than *didaskalos*, means to teach, to instruct, to inform, while *didaskalia* and *didache* signify teaching or doctrine.

The functions of preaching and teaching are closely related. The preacher is charged with a message or proclamation that he is to announce as a herald, with a view of making disciples. The teacher is put in trust with a body of doctrine or a system of teaching in which he is to instruct and establish disciples. The relation is well expressed by Matthew in his version of the commission: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you:

And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'"

The original distinction is best preserved in the offices that we assign to the evangelist, or the revivalist, and to the pastor. The characteristic work of the one is to preach, of the other to teach. Both, however, are preachers in the commonly accepted sense. How "preach" and not "teach" came to be used in a generic sense, embracing both functions, is a question perhaps curious rather than important. The main fact is that the Christian ministry combines the two functions of preaching and teaching. Moreover, in the New Testament Church they were commonly combined in the same man. Paul says he was appointed a preacher and teacher of the Gentiles in faith and hope.

The message that the preacher proclaims, and the doctrine that the teacher inculcates, are both addressed to man's spiritual nature, the only pedagogical difference being that the preacher appeals more directly to the active or motive principles of the mind. Both seek to influence conduct; the preacher to persuade men to become disciples, the teacher to lead disciples in the way of Christian living.

The minister, whether preacher or teacher, occupies important ground in common with the teacher of any other subject. He cannot reach and influence the hearer or disciple save as hearer or disciple is prepared to hear his message or lesson. Quite as much depends upon the mind as upon the object. "We reason from what we know," "We proceed from the known to the unknown," are current pedagogical maxims. When we know a new object, as one has said, "We identify the object, or those features of it which were familiar to us before; we recognize it; we explain it; we interpret the new by our previous knowledge, and thus are enabled to proceed from the known to the unknown, and make new acquisitions; in recog-

nizing the object we classify it under various general classes ; in identifying it with what we have seen before, we note also differences which characterize the new object and lead to the definition of new species or varieties.

It is not what we see and hear and feel, but what we inwardly digest, or assimilate—what we *appereive*—that really adds to our knowledge.” Thus, it is the inner eye that sees and the inner ear that hears.

And so it is with new ideas and thoughts. The mind assimilates them through what it already contains. A man must be something of an orator, poet, or preacher himself, in order to appreciate oratory, poetry, or preaching. One cannot read Milton without some sublimity; Burns, without some tenderness; Jesus, without some piety and moral elevation. And just as a man sees in a picture, a statue, or a poem some reflection of himself, so he finds in the Bible what he brings to it. At any given moment the standard of truth or of excellence is in the mind itself. Thus Coleridge said: “That is truth which finds me,” and Paul wrote: “To the pure all things are pure ; but to them that are defiled and unbelieving, nothing is pure ; but both their mind and their conscience are defiled.” The relation of objective truth to subjective truth is a wholly different question. The mind, being essentially free, does not, and cannot really receive and assimilate any spiritual idea or truth, save as such idea or truth meets its own tests. Outward obedience, as to a formal rule, is quite another matter.

There is, indeed, an important distinction between religious ideas and mathematical, scientific, and other similar ideas. The preparation that religious ideas require is not so much intellectual as moral, consisting of an ethical disposition or a spiritual tone. Still, this is by no means the exclusive property

of religious ideas. Many secular ideas and truths require a previous ethical preparation for their reception ; and it may be said, in general, that, the more closely any subject matter relates to life and duty, the more important does this antecedent ethical preparation become.

The deadness to spiritual truth of those lacking such qualification is strikingly illustrated by many instances found in the Gospels and The Acts, and its value is also constantly enforced by Jesus and the Apostles. The following passages are all from the Fourth Gospel. "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself." "Jesus therefore said to those Jews which had believed Him, 'If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'" "Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my word." The import of these passages is that acceptance of Christ's gospel and teaching depends upon a certain personal relation or adjustment to Him. Doing the will conditions knowing the teaching; or, as that great preacher, Fred. W. Robertson, puts it in his sermon on the first of the above texts: "Obedience is the organ of spiritual knowledge." The mental habit or disposition now described is the work of the Holy Spirit.

It is important to observe that the moral disposition of the pupil or disciple, as a factor in learning, is in no way peculiar to religion. The Christian doctrine on that subject has its analogue in every system of teaching. Even in the driest and most didactic studies, as mathematics and the sciences, the mental attitude of the pupil toward the teacher is an important factor in effective teaching; and when we pass beyond certainty into the field of moral truth, his attitude seriously affects

the understanding and acceptance of the matter taught. Authority implies personal confidence, while a certain amount of sympathy and willingness to be taught is indispensable to interpretation. Through our whole lives, the construction that we put upon men's actions and words, and so our views of the men themselves, depend to a considerable degree upon our mental affections toward them. The charge sometimes made against Christianity, that it demands a sympathetic spirit on the part of the disciple, may, therefore, just as well be made against any other ethical system.

To the student of the theory of education, nothing of the kind is more interesting and instructive than the routes by which the great preachers and teachers of the first age of the Church reached their ends. These ends are always the same, — to disciple, and then to teach men. But they seek them through circles or series of ideas as different as the character and training of the men whom they address. The discourses of the Teacher who came from God, in particular, deserve the closest study as examples of pedagogical method. I may mention His conversation with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well.

Even the cursory reader of The Acts sees that the book contains two kinds of sermons, and that they are divided the one from the other by a single criterion: the relation of the hearer, or of the audience, to the Messiah determines the cast of the sermon. Through all his intercourse with them, and particularly by a long series of special predictions, God was laboring to prepare the Chosen People for the fullness of time, when He should send forth His Son. The Law was their schoolmaster to bring them to Christ, and when the Son came He at once began to build on this foundation, as did His chosen messengers after Him. It would, indeed, be far from the

truth to say that in dealing with their countrymen Jesus and the Apostles always appeal to Messianic ideas. They appeal also to the primal and universal conceptions of men, as when they denounce sin, awaken conscience, and call men to repentance ; but they always move in the Messianic cycle when presenting the central doctrines of the Christian system.

The greatest Jewish sermon on record is the one preached by Peter on the day of Pentecost. On that day there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven, Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judæa and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians. Here were the Hebrew Jew and the Hellenistic Jew, Jews of Palestine and Jews of the Dispersion ; men differing in language, in general culture, in associations and environment : but men agreeing in the common possession and observance of the Law ; in common veneration for the heroes, prophets, and poets of their race, and, what is more to the purpose, in holding fast the chain of Messianic prophecy. They differed in their conceptions of the Messiah, some seeing him in David the king, some in Moses the prophet ; but they all had that faith in a restorer and a restoration which had come to be the strongest of all the national aspirations. With these facts in mind, let us follow the succession of ideas by which the Pentecostal preacher seeks their conversion.

First, he is obliged to remove a prepossession and to put himself in sympathy with his audience. Hearing the Apostles speak the various tongues represented, the multitude were all amazed and were perplexed, some asking "What meaneth this?" while others, mocking, said, "These men are filled with new

wine." Peter declares that he and his companions cannot be drunk, as they suppose, because it is only the third hour of the day, but that what the multitude hear is the fulfillment of an old prophecy.

"And it shall be in the last days, saith God,
I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh:
And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,
And your young men shall see visions,
And your old men shall dream dreams:
Yea and on my servants and on my handmaidens in those
days
Will I pour forth of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.

And it shall be, that whosoever shall call on the name of the
Lord shall be saved."

Having thus won the attention of the assembly, and turned the current of their thoughts and feelings into the desired channel, the preacher enters at once upon his argument. He declares that Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto them by mighty works, and wonders, and signs which God had done by Him in their midst, as they themselves know; whom they had by the hand of wicked men crucified and slain, Him God has raised up, having loosed the pangs of death.

The preacher then makes an appeal to the Scriptures to show that the death and resurrection of the Messiah had also been predicted. He introduces the patriarch David, whom they all revered: who, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn that of the fruit of his loins He would set one upon his throne; he, foreseeing this, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that neither was He left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption.

He now returns quickly to the former topic. "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we are all witnesses." Pressing

upon their minds the two facts that constitute the striking parallelism—the resurrection of Jesus, and the resurrection of the Messiah—and appealing to the visible outpouring of divine power: “Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear,” he passes to his grand climax: “Let all the house of Israel, therefore, know assuredly, that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified.”

The power of the sermon is proved by its extraordinary effect. This was due in part to the occasion, to the recent history, and the present manifestation of miraculous power, but it was largely due to the preacher’s skill in choosing his topics with reference to his auditors. With a Gentile congregation before him, such a sermon would have fallen upon dull ears.

The first disciples were Jews dwelling in Palestine, and even when the gospel had passed beyond Judæa the first churches were commonly composed of the devotees and adherents of the synagogue. It was no accident that Paul, on his missionary journeys, sought out his countrymen, going into the synagogues on the Sabbath and reasoning with them out of the Scriptures, proving that Jesus is Christ. Not only are nearly all the converts particularly mentioned in The Acts Jews, but these converts are made by arguments and motives that could not possibly have produced much effect upon Gentile minds. To the Jews the primitive evangelists became Jews, that they might gain Jews. But just as soon as they went among the Gentiles, they employed arguments and motives that were in no sense the products of Jewish training or culture, but that belonged to an older and more comprehensive religious teaching.

While Paul waited at Athens for the companions whom he had left behind at Berea on his hasty departure from that city, his spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city full of idols. So he reasoned in the synagogue with Jews and devout persons, and in the market place every day with them that met with him. In both places he preached Jesus and the resurrection. Brought to the Areopagus by the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, and challenged by them to make known his new teaching, the Apostle to the Gentiles delivered the most memorable of all Gentile sermons.

He begins with observing that his auditors are somewhat superstitious. "As I passed along and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with this inscription, 'To an unknown God.' What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you." Standing as he does under the noble temples of the Acropolis, and surrounded by the masterpieces of Grecian art, the Apostle's next utterance is peculiarly impressive.

"The God that made the world and all things therein, He being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is he served by men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing He himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and he made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us: for in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain even of your own poets have said, 'For we are also His offspring.' Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver,

or stone, graven by art and device of man.” Notice here the broad humanity that marks the choice of the text,—the inscription on a heathen altar, “To an unknown God.” And yet this is the same preacher who but the day before, perhaps, had reasoned with Jews and devout persons out of the Scriptures. Notice the weight and sublimity of the thoughts concerning the superiority of God to temples and to all human workmanship, and of His creation and providential government of men. Notice how the preacher draws nearer and nearer to his auditors, enforcing the thought that we live, and move, and have our being in God, with a quotation from one of their own poets, which again marks the broad humanity of the discourse. Notice how completely he saps the basis of their idolatry. What pedagogical wisdom and skill in the last appeal, where the preacher infers the nature of the Creator from the character of the creature; or, more fully, makes man the type and representative of God himself. “Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man.” All this is making himself as without law to them that are without law, that he may gain them that are without law.

We come at last to the grand conclusion. “The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked; but now He commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent: inasmuch as He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom He hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.”

Paul’s climax at the Areopagus is the same as Peter’s in Jerusalem—Jesus and the resurrection. But by what a

different route he comes to it. There is now no personal appeal to the multitude in verification of the miracles; no resort to Moses or other Old Testament authority; no reference to the Messiah. But, on the other hand, we have some of the greatest ideas of universal religion: the fact of worship, the spirituality of God, His superiority to all creatures, the Divine Fatherhood, and the call to repentance, culminating in an appeal to the Judgment and the Resurrection. Nothing could more plainly mark the Gentile character of the audience; nothing more strikingly show the preacher's mastery of his calling. For our purpose, therefore, the Athenian sermon is the counterpart of that preached in Jerusalem.

Peter on Pentecost and Paul at Areopagus stand as the two most typical examples of Jewish and Gentile sermons. Perhaps it is needless to add that the first class is much the more numerous of the two.

The Acts contain yet a third class of sermons—sermons that are neither distinctively Jewish nor distinctively Gentile. These were preached to persons more or less conversant with Jewish history and the Jewish religion, but not fully instructed.

There is an anticipation of the later Gentile sermon in the masterly discourse that Stephen preached before the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem, which led immediately to his death. This discourse is remarkable for the large use made of Jewish history, for the free spirit in which this history is handled, and for the consciousness that it breathes that the nation has come short of the glory of God, and that God far transcends the bounds within which the Jews strove to confine Him. After stating that Solomon built the temple in the room of the tabernacle, as though answering directly the charge that he had spoken

against that Holy Place and the Law, the preacher exclaims: "Howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands; as saith the prophet,

'The heaven is my throne,
And the earth the footstool of my feet;
What manner of house will ye build me? saith the Lord;
Or what is the place of my rest?
Did not my hand make all these things?'"

In grandeur, this is second only to Paul's burst of eloquence at Areopagus.

The character of the preaching at Samaria we do not very clearly know. We are merely told that Philip "proclaimed unto them the Christ," and that Peter and John "testified and spoke the word of the Lord." But in view of the fact that the Samaritans were mongrel Jews. that they had the Pentateuch in their own language, and that their temple on Mt. Gerizim was but a mimicry of Mt. Zion, we cannot doubt that the preaching was strongly Jewish in thought, tone, and language.

According to Eusebius, the Ethiopian eunuch was the first fruits of the Gentiles, and with this view, although his classification is disputed, the facts of history are in general accord. He was, however, a proselyte of the gate, as is shown by his having been to Jerusalem to worship, and by his reading the Scriptures as he now rides in his chariot on the road leading to Gaza. He is brooding over a passage in Isaiah.

"He was led as a sheep to the slaughter;
And as a lamb before his shearer is dumb,
So he opened not his mouth:
In his humiliation his judgment was taken away;
His generation who shall declare?
For his life is taken from the earth."

With such a text, Philip could do nothing but preach unto him Jesus.

All that we certainly know of the religious character of Cornelius, the Roman centurion, is that he was a "devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway." It is clear that he had some knowledge of the Jewish religion and its signification, but how much we cannot just say. His attitude was neither distinctly Jewish nor distinctly Gentile. This is plainly shown by the sermon that Peter preached to him, his kinsmen and near friends. The preacher begins with the declaration: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him," and closes with the words: "To Him bear all the prophets witness, that through His name every one that believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins." Within these limits lie a summary of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, supported by the testimony of Peter and the other Apostles, and a declaration of the commission to preach and to testify to the people.

Our studies of New Testament sermons might be greatly extended, and be made much more minute and careful. These, however, suffice to teach us some important lessons. They show that preaching can be successful only in a relative sense; that there is, and can be, no universal best sermon or best mode of preaching, but that much, very much, depends upon the mental condition of the hearer. They renew our minds in the substance of the gospel; they illustrate its primitive simplicity, whether preached from a Jewish or a Gentile pulpit. Above all, they show that its substance, as preached by the Apostles, consisted, not of a body of divinity, a theological system, or a scholastic creed, but of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, and of salvation through Him.

THE PHYSICIAN AS A CHRISTIAN.

PROF. CHAS. B. NANCREDE.

Delivered June 11, 1893.

“Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.”—*Matt. 18:3.*

I have selected this pregnant passage as the starting point for my discourse, because it seemed to me to be one peculiarly fitted for the purpose of illustrating not only the physician as a Christian, but why and how a physician should be a Christian. It is frequently asked, sometimes honestly, sometimes scornfully, whether in our day a physician can be a Christian, because the apparent revelations of science seem to be at variance with that which it is believed the Scriptures state. Let me define my position by the statement—and a most positive one—that I believe the Scriptures are absolutely true, that science is also true ; true because all truth is God’s truth, and, therefore, truth as revealed in the Bible and in nature cannot by any possibility conflict. When they apparently do so I am quite satisfied to rest my belief on the impossibility of any portion of truth really in essence differing from other portions, and prefer to think that *I* am mistaken in my comprehension of the facts. Mark you, I do not worry myself to reconcile them, for I do not believe they need this, nor do I commit the fatal error of trying to wrest the Scriptures so as to agree with every varying phase of scientific thought. This is because I am satisfied with the incontrovertible fact that all

truth is one, that no real difference, as I have already said, *can* exist, the only error being in my fallible comprehension. Again I act thus, because what has been confidently affirmed at one time in science to be the whole and final truth, has thousands of times been shown to be only a single spark of the light, which by the distorting action of improperly associated facts has conveyed, perhaps, an utterly wrong impression, no more representing the truth, than a shattered mirror can reflect the true proportions or outlines of an object placed before it.

Shall I, then, trim my Bible here, shall I impose a meaning upon it there, until at last I have, as it is improperly said, "adjusted science and revelation," only to find that science soon tells me that she is wrong, that instead of the full, clear light of perfect truth, I have been blinding my judgment and rendering patent my own hidden skepticism in God's revealed truth for less than nothing ; have reconciled nothing—for there was naught to reconcile—at the expense of shaken trust ? No, let me confidently stand firm upon the foundation fact, that all truth is God's, of which at best I can only see a part at a time, and that nothing is requisite but trust in him, who the Truth itself, cannot lie in either nature or revelation ; that in his own good time here, or on the other side of the river of death, all will be clear, for "now we see through a glass darkly ; but then face to face ; now I know in part ; but then I shall know even as also I am known." Who is it that brings revelation into disrepute ? Is it not the so-called believer who is so afraid that the Scriptures are not true, that he must defend them against scientific attack ; who never waits before laying his lance in rest, to ascertain whether the science be true or

false, whether he is attacking the Giant Error, or, like the Knight of La Mancha, a wind-mill. Such an one, consequently, states that the Bible means this thing to refute some attack believed to lie hidden in one scientific fact, then that it teaches something different to suit some other supposed scientific difficulty. No wonder the scientist sneers, and if he has any remnant of belief, loses it !

But you will say, " If all truth is one, both that of religion and of nature, why does not the scientist become a believer in revealed religion ?" My friends, as has been so often proven by the lives of illustrious men, although the highest scientific training and knowledge is no bar to orthodox religious belief, *if a man starts with such convictions*, it has also been abundantly proven that science rarely, if ever, *alone* leads up to religious belief ; for are we not told " that no man by searching can find out God" ? Surely this means searching in his own way, guided by his own self-made rules. Without further delay in adducing such common arguments as that revelation does not pretend to teach science, that it could not have given this knowledge except in the parlance of the times when written, so that what might have been *then* correct phraseology, could not but convey a wrong impression *now*, I shall pass on to a consideration of some of the chief reasons why science, in my judgment, does not lead to religious belief, and then on rational grounds explain my conviction that a physician should be a Christian.

Any fair-minded person will, I think, admit that the reasons I have given for the faith that is in me, show at least the possibility of being a Christian physician, so far as the supposed conflict between science and religion is concerned. I believe that in time all the apparent difficulties will disappear ;

but time is requisite, not the brief span of my life or yours, perhaps, but cycles, "for a thousand years are in his sight but as yesterday, when it is past, and as a watch in the night." If God took thousands of years to prepare the world for the revelation of Himself, as embodied in his Incarnate Son, is it a matter for wonder that his revelation of the wonders of the natural world, of the laws which govern it, of their true relation to spiritual laws should, also, require ages for their perfect elucidation? Be patient; in *God's* good time, not *ours*, all will be as clear as the noon-day, "wait, I say, *patiently* upon the Lord and he will give thee thy heart's desire."

Why does not science lead to religious belief? Read my text, "Except ye become as little children." The scientist claims that to be a real searcher after truth, it is an absolute prerequisite to approach the investigation of any subject without prejudice, and that next the nature and scope of the evidence necessary to satisfy himself first, and others afterwards, of any truth, must be determined. With such a preparation in most instances correct conclusions will be arrived at in science, and so I contend it would be in religion. The scientist does not discover one kind of God's truth because he is not truly scientific according to his own self-imposed conditions, he will not approach revelation with the child-like condition of mind, the true *tabula rasa* which he properly demands as a preliminary to any investigation of natural truth, and then he most unscientifically demands that the nature and extent of the evidence shall be identical with that which he accepts as conclusive regarding natural phenomena. When he is in doubt concerning his interpretation of natural facts, after determining what evidence is requisite, he then arranges such experiments as shall settle his doubts. So also

in religious matters, thousands of those who were once honestly doubting experimenters, answer, "Whosoever shall *do* the will of God, shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether it be of man." This is the only scientific method of determining the matter. Follow precisely the plan you would employ if some chemical problem were involved. Comply with the requirements of previous experimenters and abide by their results ; but be honest ; see to it that every preliminary is complied with, not as you think best, but as the original observer claims is requisite to reach the results he attained.

I contend that the Christian physician is the best raw material for a good scientist. He can fearlessly approach any subject utterly unbiased, in the child-like frame of mind developed by true religion. He knows that it is not only safe to study science, but that in doing so he is unfolding new portions of God's ceaseless revelation to man ; nay more, he feels that it is his high privilege and yet more his duty, to thus study and help reveal the majesty, the unsuspected justice, goodness, and grandeur of the workings of the mind of the Omnipotent ruler of the Universe in all the minute details of what are called the physical and natural laws by which he has seen fit to govern his universe. Do you think that such a man can lose his faith because at the stage of knowledge he has attained to, some non-essential sentence here and there in the Scriptures, which he has been told teaches a certain thing, no longer bears the same meaning ? Will his faith be staggered, when every new natural phenomenon he observes, goes to prove the reign of intelligent law, which insures the perfect working out of the marvellous intricacies of the Universe ? Will he not become more and more firmly convinced that this material life and the laws that govern it cannot explain

innumerable facts of common observation, but which the laws of revealed religion can with as unerring accuracy render clear, as his natural laws do his material facts? Never can *he* lose faith!! It may be fanciful, but I sometimes dream and I always hope, that perhaps in the future state the true Christian scientist will receive the fruition of his labors here, in having vouchsafed to him there, what he has so long sought for in vain below—the true explanation of many an insoluble scientific problem.

Remember that all I have said is simply a statement of the point of view from which I, as a physician and a Christian, have been led to consider the relations of science and revealed religion, and while I believe it may be helpful to many, I can readily conceive that in different ways the same end can be more readily arrived at by others. If, therefore, what I have said does not enable you to satisfy both your religious and your scientific scruples, do not at once conclude either that I am wrong, that science is wrong, or revealed religion a series of myths, but strive to find the path by which you can most readily arrive at the only goal which will leave you satisfied to strive no further—a life-moulding faith in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Let me read to you the ancient Hippocratic oath formerly taken by all those devoting themselves to the practice of medicine. I shall omit a few sentences, which, although they illustrate very forcibly the position I am about to take, yet are couched in language that we are unfortunately now-a-days not too moral, but too prudish, to listen to.

“I swear by Apollo, the physician, and Æsculapius and Health and All-heal, and all the gods and goddesses, that according to my ability and judgment, I will keep this oath

and this stipulation—to reckon him who taught me this art equally dear to me as my parents, to share my substance with him, and relieve his necessities if required, to look upon his offspring on the same footing as my brother, and to teach them this art, if they shall wish to learn it, without either fee or stipulation, and that by precept, lecture, and every other mode of instruction, I will impart a knowledge to disciples bound by an oath according to the law of medicine. I will follow that system of regimen, which, according to my ability and judgment, I consider for the benefit of my patients, and abstain from whatever is deleterious and mischievous. I will give no deadly medicine to any one if asked nor suggest any such counsel. With purity and holiness I will pass my life and practice my art.”.....“Into whatever houses I enter, I will go into them for the benefit of the sick, and will abstain from every voluntary act of mischief and corruption.” “Whatever, in connection with my professional practice, or not in connection with it, I see or hear in the life of men, which ought not to be spoken of abroad, I will not divulge, as reckoning that all such should be kept secret. While I continue to keep this oath unviolated, may it be granted to me to enjoy life and the practice of the art, respected by all men, in all times. But should I trespass and violate this oath, may the reverse be my lot.”

Is such an ideal of the professional life thus shadowed forth in those far-off heathen times impossible *now*, with the competition, the rush to become famous or rich, or both? Shame upon our boasted modern civilization if we answer nay, and yet it is impossible in either its essence or its reality except as exemplified by the Christian physician. You may ask me for specific instances of the truth which I now assert,

that it is a matter of daily occurrence to him who has eyes to see. To the Jews our Lord was only an illiterate carpenter's son, who blasphemously claimed to be God, but to whom, as he says, by the Spirit was given sight, he was seen in his true light ; so now to those whose spiritual vision has been cleared by striving to follow the "footsteps of His most holy life," even although stumbling and miserably falling again and again, unselfish devotion to duty, the abnegation of self and pelf that physical health may be given to others, the resistance of temptations, which peculiarly beset a doctor, are recognized to be instigated by the Spirit of Christ working in many a man, and just in the measure that any physician recognizes and fulfills his professional duties as being done unto God and not *unto* and *for men*, is he a Christian.

Whose spirit, when the natural desire for ease or rightful relaxation says, "Enough has been done in acquiring knowledge or caring for the sick," replies "No, you work not for yourself but for others, your standard should be Christ's, the utmost for others, even if it costs life itself"? Who, when the question arises, "Shall I peril reputation or practice by calling assistance, thereby running the risk of another being considered my superior in skill," sternly replies, "'Get thee behind me, Satan,' for no such motive can be allowed for one instant to stand in the way of another's good"? Who, when his patient is in perilous straits, knowing that all his own skill has been exhausted in vain, that help cannot be obtained from others, yet confidently trusts that if a way of escape be possible, in some manner guidance unto it will be vouchsafed him, not by miracle or interference with natural laws, but *by means of the latter* ; or, if failure must ensue, calmly feels that all has been done that was possible and the result has been over-

ruled by a higher power? Who, when professional disappointments and failures seem about to crush him to the earth, feels that he can bear all because in some way it must be for his or others' good? The physician who is a Christian; and he attains this ideal I have outlined, just in proportion as the spirit of Christ is his. When disease, against which the physician can have no more protection than the layman, is to be met, *not* in public, *not* when thousands will applaud the heroic deed, but in his everyday work among his pauper patients, when no human being can know whether the duty is manfully done at all risks, or cowardly fled from, does the Christian physician do anything but think shame of himself if he falters? When self-interest, reputation, money or position are to be balanced against some questionable practice; when some slanderous remark is uttered or some misapprehension exists as to another physician's conduct, which, if left uncorrected, would, must, do his fellow harm and himself good, what does the Christian physician do? Manfully strives to turn a deaf ear to worldly sophistry, to ward off the slander, to correct the understanding. When in the wrong—and who is there that never errs?—he is willing to acknowledge this, and, when possible, repair the damage.

The timid is made strong by feeling that he has an Almighty arm to rest upon for support and guidance; the naturally reckless man has his rashness restrained by a solemn conviction of the rights of others and by the knowledge that he must some day give an account of the deeds done in the body.

Some will say we never hear of all this; far otherwise, we know of just the reverse! Sneers, back-biting, open attacks upon one another among physicians, and some of them

professing Christians. Unfortunately this cannot be denied, yet why is it? Because these men are Christians in name only, not in deed. Their Christianity is left with their prayer-book and their Bible at home, only of use in the church, on one day of the week. This explains this deplorable display of the evil side of human nature, not that true Christianity does not and cannot prevent such things.

Again, the physician as a Christian is fitted to have confided to his care those who are dearer to us than life. To him we are compelled to turn in difficulties which no other man ever dreams of. His advice and his relations to us are different from those of all others of our fellow men, and surely such a man should possess a standard, and be actuated by motives which will enable him to rise above earthly temptations. To how many of us physicians are freely confided secrets which only the Romish confessional can wring from human lips, and which, if not handled in a truly Christian spirit, would wreck the happiness of whole families! Think of the endless opportunities for good or for evil so constantly opened to the physician. Who, so often as he, can condone the sin, make light of or nullify its physical results and so help on in the downward course, or, unknown to all but God and his patient, show sin in its true colors, make virtue the more attractive because the safer, and give a helping hand to one ready to perish. Aye, *ready* to perish, but not bound to die morally and spiritually, if—ah there is the trouble—if, not only the word in season, but the *act* in season, renders the word possible of fruition.

The reproof of the clergyman only causes mental revolt and an effect the reverse of that intended, or too often falls with but little weight upon ears accustomed to pastoral

rebukes, because regarded as mere perfunctory dicta, the necessary professional attitude towards evil doing. The same words come with telling force from the doctor's lips, from the fellow layman, who professes to be on, and is expected to occupy no higher moral or spiritual plane than his fellows. This, too, from one who has helped his hearer or his listener's dear ones, who has won at least a right to an indulgent hearing, as our Lord did, first doing a physical good as an earnest of a possible spiritual healing. Christ went about doing good, physical good, healing all manner of bodily infirmities, and then he taught spiritual truths; let the followers of the good Physician go and do likewise.

This method of proving, and then teaching Christianity, old as our Lord's time, well recognized by many in the so-called dark ages, is again coming into vogue for the heathen abroad. Why not employ it for the heathen at home?

Must, then, the doctor go about first prescribing and then preaching? Far from it! Let him strive to live the life of Christ. Let him boldly denounce sin, or error when it *confronts him*, not seek it out for attack. While not talking cant, when religion is the topic of conversation, quietly let it be seen on which side he stands, but avoid worthy controversy. Let it be clearly seen that he first thinks of others' good before his own, and in nine cases out of ten both his patients and the public will recognize that he is actuated by other motives than those of worldly policy; will by observation or inquiry learn what is the main-spring of his actions, and he will preach daily that best of all sermons, a good life.

Are there none but Christians who in any measure fulfil the ideal which I have attempted to delineate? No fair-minded man can deny that irreligious men, nay infidels, at

times are noble examples of uprightness and morality. But they are this only in virtue of what they have unconsciously imbibed from the Christian atmosphere in which they have lived, and in which all our literature has been produced. It is as absurd to deny this influence as for one of us to contend that we do not owe our physical lives to the oxygen of the air we breathe, because we do not recognize its presence and do not understand its properties, nay choose in our wilful ignorance to deny its actual existence. Of course these remarks are not intended to apply to the ancient heathen examples of eminent morality and uprightness, yet these men reached such moral altitudes by virtue of their belief in the existence of something more than this physical universe.

Will every or any Christian physican be perfect? Will he always live up to his convictions? Does any worldly man? No! Spiritual, like natural maturity, is a gradual process, so that although the Christian may fall, yet shall he rise again, and if he strives to become as a little child he shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven, not only hereafter, but here, and shall at the end hear the welcome words, "Well done, good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

In conclusion, let me endeavor to correct some misapprehensions under which irreligious men seem to labor. No true Christian plumes himself upon being more righteous than his brother-sinners. It is quite the reverse. Instead of thinking himself better, he knows he is worse, for his sins are against light. That which he is striving to do, his real working rule, despite what worldly men may say he ought to do and to be, is "If, by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the

dead. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth for those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." If St. Paul chose to express his idea of Christian endeavor and what his own religious position was by these sentences, we ought to be satisfied, and others abandon sneering at those who strive not to be better than their fellows, *but better than they themselves have been in the past.*

The second fact is, that because there are unworthy children of the kingdom, the world has no right to consider all are hypocrites and base. The parable of the tares, and also that of the net full of divers fishes, *both* good and bad, shows this. And who are we to judge? What do we know of any man's temptations, struggles or falls; "to his own master he standeth or falleth, yea he shall be holden up," and how do we know how others view our actions!

Let us each strive to attain the full measure of the stature of a Christian and let our fellows settle their own affairs with the Father of all, who is infinitely more merciful in his judgments than man.

WHY SHOULD A TEACHER BE A CHRISTIAN?

DR. ELMER E. BROWN.

Delivered March 20, 1892.

A question like this, implying that a teacher may not be a Christian, would have sounded very strange three or four centuries ago in the ears of any Christian community. It would have been a strange question to raise in any of the Universities in Christian lands. Why should a teacher be a Christian? It went without saying that he must not only be a Christian but have taken holy orders as well. But times have changed. I dare say one of those old, mediæval worthies, whether clerical or civil or royal, would find it hard to adjust his ideas to this new order of things; and it is well-nigh certain he would fail to realize how much more significant the Christianity of a teacher becomes when it involves his own free choice and is no longer a matter of course.

I wish to offer as my first answer to this question that, if I rightly understand the state of the case, a teacher should be a Christian for the same reasons that would lead any other man, woman, or child to be a Christian. A teacher is a man before he is a teacher—a man or a woman, standing up before God and the world in the simple responsibility of manhood, of womanhood. And any teacher who is less than this has not begun to be a teacher yet in the true sense of the word. Why, then, should a teacher be a Christian? Why should any being formed in the image of God be a Christian? This is the question to be

answered first. After that we may find special reasons, and they are not few, why a teacher, because of his calling, finds this obligation resting on him in a special and peculiar form.

To the first question, then—Why should a teacher or why should any man be a Christian in view of the simple fact of his humanity?—my answer may seem old-fashioned, but such as it is I will speak it out.

After all our theorizing, after all our science, after all our theology or rejection of theology, the unconquerable fact remains that we have sinned.

We may study sin in its psychological and ethical bearings, we may stake it out and fence it into its appropriate pen in our systems of metaphysics, and then flatter ourselves with the common fallacy that a fact explained is a fact overthrown; but our conscience still assures us there is guilt resting upon us. We cannot shift the responsibility, for we know in our hearts that we have sinned. We have done the things that we ought not to have done and have left undone the things that we ought to have done. I pray God, He will send us one breath of Heaven's pure air this morning to clear away whatever mists of speculation we have allowed to obscure our consciences, that we may have the clearer view of our responsibility and of our need.

Let us note some of the strong words of Scripture upon this fact of human sinfulness: "As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one. . . . They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one, . . . Now we know, that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. . . . For there is no difference.

For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. . . . Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. . . . I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. Oh wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

[Part of the 3d and 7th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans.]

This is not a pleasant subject to dwell upon. But untold harm has been done by glossing it over. If there were not hope of better things, it would be but a devilish performance to hold up before men a picture of their shame and misery. The gospel is faithful to the truth in that it takes men where they are and tells them of their guilt. It is faithful to the larger truth in that it tells of hope for those whom sin has brought to ruin. When John the Baptist came to prepare the way for one mightier than himself, his message was, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." When the Lord sent out the twelve before his face, "they went out, and preached that men should repent." When Jesus after the imprisonment of John, "came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God," he said, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." Here is the starting point for every one, be he accountant or emperor or chimney-sweep or teacher, who, finding himself in this life, desires to live. . . . I.

would that some one of the pure in heart, who see God every day and whose lips are touched with a coal from off His altar, might speak to us on this theme this morning. His words would not be cold and measured but would go home to all hearts. I doubt not some of you, listening to such a one, would lay aside for a day the scientific inquiry into phenomena or the æsthetic contemplation of the world, and cry out from the depths of life-long need, "What must I do to be saved from sin?"

This, then, is my first reason for urging teachers that they be Christians first: Because of sin; because of the forgiveness and deliverance which has been brought to men by Jesus Christ; because that here, as I believe, in repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, is the beginning of all true life.

Not only on account of sin and its forgiveness do I believe a man should be a Christian, but also on account of faith. In the words just quoted from the great apostle, it was not only repentance toward God that was preached, but equally faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. I remember seeing a little boy come pale and trembling into school. It was his first day in that school. His face and bearing told a story of his sorry little life up to that moment. He had been scolded and cuffed ever since he could remember. He was afraid to speak or move for fear of violating some rule. I believe his mother was kind at heart, but her very righteousness had scared the boy. What change came over his life under the care of the patient and gentle woman who was now his teacher. Trembling, fear, misery, were changed to confidence and happiness. The sunshine of life chased away the shadows from his face and heart. We children of a larger growth become morbid and fearful

when the thought of our sins is kept ever before us. We may even grow morbid and sentimental if we dwell exclusively on the thought of God's love and forgiveness. But a healthy and genuine faith tones up the spirit of a man and nerves him for noble deeds.

There are two aspects of faith which come out of daily life. One is conviction, the other confidence. Confidence as we commonly use the word is faith in persons. Conviction is faith in reality without reference to personal feelings. The most of the great questions of a lifetime have to be answered not on the ground of demonstrable fact, of certain knowledge, but on the ground of half knowledge, half faith—to the best of one's knowledge and belief. So a man's strong and intelligent convictions, where the way is dim with mist, may have greater significance for his success in life than his certain knowledge in things that are plain and easy. And convictions on the higher plane work down on the lower planes with deepening and ennobling power. Commercial insight is a good thing. Let high political principle be added, and the view of the mere man of business is broadened and elevated thereby. Add a sound moral sense, beyond what is necessarily involved in the others, and the affairs of business, and public policy are brought into truer perspective, convictions in these domains are charged with greater meaning. Now let the convictions be raised to the realm of the divine, let them be sober and sincere, and see how new order, light and certainty are introduced into all the subordinate concerns of life, by bringing them into relations with the center of all things. So much for faith as conviction. In like manner faith as confidence is good and beautiful in the commonest things of life. The confidence of a child in its parents, of a friend in his friend, gives courage and joy to the

heart. The sight of a great leader of men putting his trust in the general right-mindedness of countrymen in things political, a William of Orange, a Lincoln, a Gladstone, is truly inspiring. Let confidence be advanced beyond the mere relations of earth, let it be centered in God, and the light caught from the Father's face will shine down through all lower faiths and loves, transfiguring them into the likeness of Heaven. Faith as conviction will prompt a man to be a Christian because it is right. Faith as confidence persuades a man to be a Christian because the love of Christ constraineth. The true faith of the Christian is conviction and confidence in one—right joined with love—and fixed on the righteous and loving God our Savior. This is the faith that re-makes lives after the image of Christ our Lord. For the sake of transforming faith like this I would urge men and teachers to enter the Christian life.

I will mention but one more reason here. Be a Christian because of sin and its forgiveness, because of faith, and finally because of permanence. The desire of man for eternal life is no mean desire. It is a noble aspiration, a true and manly instinct. The shallow and trifling run after the things of a day; but earnest souls strive for those things that endure.

Ruskin says in speaking of Architecture: "Every human action gains in honor, in grace, in all true magnificence by its regard to things that are to come. It is the far sight, the quiet and confident patience, that, above all other attributes, separate man from man, and near him to his Maker; and there is no action nor art, whose majesty we may not measure by this test. Therefore, when we build, let us think that we build forever."

I take it our ambition in the making of a life should not

be lower than in the building of a house. And how shall we build forever? The world passeth away. The trust that rests even on princes among men is but vain. To whom shall we go but to Him who has the words of eternal life. The world passeth away, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever.

My time is half gone and I have said nothing about the special obligation resting upon teachers. But the time thus spent is not wasted if the one word that I had in mind to speak has come home to your hearts. It is more than half the work of a teacher that he begin by being a noble, Christian man.

Now how is the obligation of following Christ increased by the fact that one is a teacher? The true teacher is moved to his work by a high and sacred love of his pupils. His heart goes out to them in all their needs. Their interests are his own. The great facts of sin, and faith and immortality are facts for each of them as much as for himself. If these facts prompt him to enter the Christian life on his own account, they prompt him as many times over as the number of pupils in his charge, to be a Christian for their sake. He knows their conflicts with sin, and often their surrender, better perhaps than their fathers and mothers can know. It calls for all his faith to believe that wrong already deeply fixed can be uprooted and forgiven. His best efforts often seem but things of a day, erased at night like chalk marks from a black-board and leaving no trace behind. What hope has he of permanence, but in bringing each day's work at its close and laying it with simple trust in the hands of his Father in Heaven.

It is such a life as this that has glorified the work of the great teachers down through all the ages.

Comenius is said to have "consecrated himself to infancy,"

and to have felt that he was working "for the regeneration of humanity."

The gentlemen of Port Royal engaged with extraordinary zeal and intelligence in the work of their "Little Schools," feeling that they were saving the souls of their young charges from the greatest danger. "We must always pray for souls," said one of them, "and always be on the watch, standing guard as in a city menaced by the enemy. On the outside the devil makes his rounds."

La Salle organized his Christian Schools and led the way with faith and zeal and self sacrifice for the efforts of the Catholic church toward the education of the little children of the poor.

Pestalozzi in the days of his greatest poverty and depression held fast to his purpose to teach those poorer than himself, stayed in his mind with the thought that he was performing a religious duty. "Christ teaches us," he wrote, "by his example and doctrine to sacrifice not only our possessions but ourselves for the good of others."

Dean Stanley writes of Thomas Arnold, "The relation of an instructor to his pupils was to him, like all the other relations of human life, only a healthy state when subordinate to their common relation to God. 'The business of a school-master,' he used to say, 'no less than that of a parish minister, is the cure of souls.'"

Mary Lyon gave her days and nights, her strength, her all, to the end that young women might have opportunities of higher education, and still more that they might rise to higher Christian character and service.

Examples might be multiplied indefinitely. Among the rank and file of our teachers to-day like motives are by no

means rare. Witness the high ground taken at the outset of the late meeting of the association of teachers of this state, and maintained throughout the sessions of that gathering.

The great majority of American teachers are engaged in public schools and in these schools the teaching of religious creeds is prohibited by law. Why should a teacher in a public school be a Christian? It is generally agreed that the chief business of the public schools is to train up citizens to be not only intelligent but moral. But this most important problem of the schools is also the most difficult. We can train pupils to right habits of thought; how can we insure information of right habits of action? Some things in this direction we certainly can do. Through our school discipline we can secure the exercise of some of the most obvious and objective virtues. By skillful instruction and questioning we can accustom our pupils to pass correct ethical judgments. Through instruction in history and literature we can set before them high ideals of life. A right mechanism of daily routine, sound judgment, and high ideals; these three steps once taken, it is but one step further to the realizing of ideals of personal character. And just here, at this last, essential step, in critical cases our system breaks down and can go no further. What can the public school do beyond this point? It can go a little further still, but that little further cannot be expressed in formulas or defined in a course of study. After instruction and training have done their best, the true teacher has still the power of imparting by a subtle, sympathetic influence, somewhat of his own spirit to the children in his care. This is the necessary condition of efficient moral training in public schools. This is the fine edge of the art of all great educators. Such moral influence as this violates no constitutional provision regarding the separation of

church and state. In conflicts with no decision of the courts. Against such teaching there is no law. It satisfies the claims of those who emphasize the demand that public schools be unsectarian.

But there is strong demand from another party in the state that non-sectarianism be not made equivalent to irreligion. If the requirement on the first named side that instruction be non-sectarian is a just demand--and in the name of freedom and equal rights, I believe it is fully justified;—this counter requirement that the school shall not be irreligious is also a just demand, in the name of that Christian faith which gave us our schools and stands as the surest ground of equal rights and freedom. And these are not opposing policies. In the Christian teacher both demands are in a large sense satisfied. For the highest morality is Christian morality. The spirit in the teacher which, imparted to a school, will do the most for both intelligence and morality is the humble, reverent, earnest, loving spirit of the truly Christian man or woman. And if this be not the teaching of a creed it teaches more of the faith than any creed. The minister of Christ who turns many to righteousness is he who imparts the most of the spirit of Christ, by giving the most of himself, imbued in every fibre of his being with that spirit. If we had distinct religious teaching in the schools, this would still be the best part of it; and as between the formal teaching of the creeds without this spirit, and the imparting of this spirit without formal teaching of the creeds, from the standpoint of the faith we would unhesitatingly choose the latter. Where Christian people and Christian colleges devote a part of their wealth and strength to training teachers for the public schools, who are at once true to our laws and the spirit of our institutions, and true to Christ and filled with his spirit—I

know not whether the immediate result is increase in the membership of churches; but the ultimate result will be the spread of true and living faith, the surest defense of the church, the soundest prop of the state, the assurance of the healthiest morality.

But there is one thing more I wish to say regarding the Christian teacher in the public schools. While our schools are non-sectarian, and rightly so, let us not be beguiled into a hasty judgment on the spirit of our laws and institutions, so as to admit that Christian teaching is excluded from those schools. The catechism and articles of faith are excluded; I grant it and rejoice it is so. The reading of the Bible as a religious observance or a means of instruction is forbidden in many of the schools; I grant it—in many of the schools—but not in all and not in half of them; and if I taught where it is so forbidden, I would accept the condition in good faith, however unnecessary or unfortunate I might think such provision from my point of view. But Christian teaching still is not shut out. Let the laws be complied with in their letter and in their spirit, not unwillingly but heartily. But when the critic of the schools reads into the laws a veto on religion, an interdiction in the schools of what is best in modern thought and highest in modern civilization, I deny the interpretation. These laws were not passed in the interest of infidelity but of freedom. The legislators who voted for them were not in the main enemies of religion. They were not men who either for themselves or their children would have the state crush out the best part of the sweetness and the hope and the inspiration of our literature, our culture and our civilization. The state is not the enemy of religion. The separation of church and state has not shut up the state against all recognition of religion in any form or manner. Men may see the further secular-

ization of the state if they will, but so long as the state is not irreligious do not ask the schools of the state to be.

But there is another reason why the schools of this Christian land in this Christian age must not be unchristian. The state puts certain persons into its schools to teach. It does not demand, and it has no right to demand, that these teachers teach in such a way as merely to bring up citizens for the state. A teacher must teach in accordance with true principles of education. It may fairly be questioned whether the state has any right to determine how a teacher shall teach than it has to determine how a farmer shall cultivate the soil, or how a captain shall sail his ship. In the one case the principles of navigation must be the guide, in the other the rules of agriculture, in the third the science of teaching. Within reasonable limits the laws of the art should be supreme. It does not then appear that the teacher is forbidden, whatever the science of education may direct, to mention the Bible or the name of God in his school-room. If Christ is the ideal of manhood in modern civilization, it would seem fair that the teacher in a modern school be not required to limit himself to a reference to lower ideals. The best literature is full of the spirit of Christ, and the best teaching avails itself of that literature and seeks to realize the Christian standard. And if the teacher shall send out his pupils from the common schools with the assurance that there are other and higher things to learn in life than the best books of the school contain, with open minds and heart for whatever instruction the various relations in life, the state, society, the church, can give to them, it will be a sign that he has cared for the continued growth and expansion of their intellect, and still more, for steady striving after higher and the highest things.

Let me in closing illustrate the thought I have to present. I received a letter a few weeks ago, the handwriting of which looked like that of one of my nearest friends; but the lines were so wavering and uncertain I feared at first that he was ill. This is the way the letter ran—I give you a part of it word for word:

“DEAR UNCLE ELMER,—I hope you are very well.— Papa is holding my hand but I say what to write.— M— and K—have two great big dolls.—Papa reads to us almost every night. It is ’most time to go to bed.

Good-by,”

and it was signed in printed letters all her own by my friend’s little five-year-old girl. I don’t know when I have received a letter that touched me as did that one from the little wee thing who called me uncle. It is not very much of the world that she has seen and she knows very little of school, but she has found a true philosophy of life for teachers as well as taught. Those little ones, our pupils, put their hands into ours and what they write will bear marks of our guidance. And I know nothing better that we teachers can do than to place our hand in that of the kind Heavenly Father and while putting our own words into the message, as He would have us do, still try our best not to jar or interfere while He writes the lines for us.

SIC UTERE TUO UT ALIENUM NON LAEDAS.

PROF. FLOYD R. MECHEM.

Delivered April 9, 1893.

The sentiment which I have chosen as the starting point for what I have to say to-day, is contained in one of the old maxims of the law. Maxims have been said to be the condensed wisdom of nations, the crystalization of truths which the experience of ages has painfully and slowly evolved, and which have finally come to be regarded as so self-evident and necessary as to require no other authority than their own inherent force.

Conceptions of truth, however, almost invariably suffer from the attempt to put them into language. The moment they begin to crystalize, that moment they begin to lose their power of growth and expansion. At best, the maxims of one age can but represent the highest conception of the thought and progress of that age, and they need frequent revision and correction to enable them to keep pace with the growth of knowledge. The sententious wisdom of one age, therefore, ought not to be accepted as the best expression of the wisdom of a succeeding age. Maxims are dangerous bases of reliance, for though they may express the truths of to-day they are very apt to express but the half-truths of to-morrow.

The mental and moral condition of the race, like its physical condition, is the result of evolution. Each age shows the high-water mark which the tide of civilization has reached.

Slowly, painfully, but, in the main, certainly, does knowledge advance. Of no science is this more true than of the science of the law. Starting with rude and primitive conceptions, the common law which forms the great body which regulates the ordinary affairs of men, has developed with the race, though keeping always a little behind its most marked advance. Looking back upon it from this standpoint, it is often pitiful to observe by what hard methods its progress has been made; how it has had to grope and feel its way along, and to what erroneous and often fatal conclusions it has been led in its efforts to find the light. It has come a devious way, and all along its course may be seen the evidence of aberrations which would be difficult to understand if we did not at the same time observe equally pronounced departures along the other lines which mark the progress of the race.

Our common law found its origin among a rude, but also a hardy and liberty-loving people. Something in their source and much in their insular position, gave the English race the characteristic of a sturdy and somewhat testy assertion and defense of what they believe to be their personal rights of liberty and property. When restrained by proper limitations, this quality is productive of a national character marked by valuable attributes of courage, enterprise and progress, but if unrestrained, it tends naturally to produce habits of self-aggrandizement and disregard for the rights of others which are fatal to the true progress of the whole people.

Many and fierce were the struggles by which the English people secured their rights of liberty and property, and the more hardly they were attained, the more valuable and paramount did they naturally seem when once secured.

Having once established the principle of the individual

right of property and liberty, the step is a short and natural one which leads to the haughty and defiant inquiry: May not a man do what he will with his own? To the individual interested, there seems usually but one answer and that the affirmative one. If this personal liberty of which I boast is really mine, as I claim it is; if this property which I possess is really mine, as I have been and am ready to maintain against all comers; why may I not do with either as I will? Does not the very statement of the right necessarily exclude all limitations? If I am subject to restraint, not self imposed, then I am not free, and this freedom of which I have boasted is an illusion. If I may not do as I will with this property which I have called my own, then it is not my own, but partly some one else's. There seems here to be an inconsistency, which the individual will be disposed to settle by denying the right of any restraint, and by asserting in all its fullness the doctrine of absolute independence.

However sound or salutary this doctrine might prove in a community where but one person had, or claimed, the right to exercise it, it is obvious that in a community where many claimed to possess and exercised the same right, conflict is inevitable; for its exercise in full by one must often operate to deny to others an equal exercise. Restraint of some kind is therefore obviously indispensable. It is an old struggle which has been seen in many departments,—this struggle between liberty, properly so regarded, and that which is often demanded in the name of liberty, but which in fact is nothing else than unrestrained license.

Realizing this necessity for restraint, the English law, after much tentative endeavor, has laid down the rule which finds its crystalized form of expression in the maxim: *Sic utere tuo*

ut alienum non laedas,—so use your own as not to injure another. This, says Blackstone, speaking of the English law, is the only restriction which the genius of a free nation, who claim the right of using their own property as they please, has placed upon the ownership of property or the exercise of any other public or private right. And our own Chief Justice Waite has said that this maxim furnishes the rule by which every member of society possesses and enjoys his property.

Upon its face, this maxim seems so reasonable and just that we might almost conclude that here we had found an universal rule by which the legal exercise of the rights of property and of personal liberty could in all cases be determined. But unfortunately it is not found to be universally applicable, and one learned judge has gone so far as to say that, though it is a very good moral precept, it is utterly useless as a legal guide. Another has said that “its real use is to warn us against an abuse of the more popular adage that ‘a man has a right to do as he likes with his own’ which errs more dangerously on the other side.” How far it falls short of being an universal rule may be made evident by a few illustrations which may also serve to indicate the need of some other limitation.

My neighbor builds himself a house upon a lot adjoining mine which is still vacant. His lot is so situated that across my vacant lot he obtains not only a most delightful view which adds as well to the pecuniary as to the esthetic value of his home, and also furnishes his chief supply of light and air. I afterwards determine to build upon my lot, and do so, necessarily or unnecessarily, in such a manner as to entirely cut off his view and his main supply of light and air, thereby inflicting not only personal discomfort, but serious pecuniary injury. The law gives him no redress against me.

He has a spring upon his land which for many years has furnished to him and his cattle refreshing draughts of pure water. It is shaded and protected by a tree upon my land and without its shade the spring must fail before the fierce attacks of the summer sun. For my own purposes, I cut down the tree and thereby destroy the spring. I have so used my own property as to seriously injure his, but he is without remedy.

One of two rival banks quietly collects a large amount of the notes of the other, and then, with the intention to injure, presents them all for payment at a time when it is known that it will imperil if not destroy the credit of the other; yet the other is remediless.

A business man is doing a small but profitable business in a certain locality which will not support two such establishments. A rival, with greater means, establishes himself next door and then deliberately undersells the other till he drives him unto financial ruin. For this the law has no remedy.

One man, by no active misrepresentation, but by that kind of seductive talk which the law, (which tolerates much lying in trade) sometimes denominates "seller's praise", induces another to make a bargain which he knows will probably prove, and which does prove, disastrous to a person of the other's means and condition. The law supplies no remedy.

A profitable stage route, and with it a number of successful inns along the way, is robbed of its value because of the opening of a railway through the neighborhood, but the railway company is not liable to the stage owner and the inn keeper.

And so I might go on, but these illustrations are sufficient

to show that the maxim of the law does not furnish an universal rule. I do not mean to say that the law in these respects is defective, or that it ought to undertake, in more cases than it already does, to throw a kind of parental guardianship about the frailer members of the community, or to restrain the exercise of rights of liberty or property simply because some one thereby suffers an incidental injury. Neither do I stop to inquire whether, for some of these cases, there is not a higher standard than the law to which our human laws ought more and more to be made to approximate. I simply wish to use this as a starting point from which to enter another field.

We claim to be free moral agents. We assert that we possess a moral and intellectual freedom which is of a no less exclusive kind than that physical freedom which it was the purpose of this old maxim of the law to restrain and control. But *is* it more unrestrained than that? Is there no maxim in *this* field which demands that here also we shall so use the liberty which we possess as not to injure others? This, like the other, is an old question and has been so ably dealt with that it might seem superfluous if not presumptuous for us to raise it here, were it not for the fact that through perpetual agitation the truth is sometimes made more clear.

I take it for granted that every one recognizes the existence of certain limitations and restraints which each individual puts upon his own action for the purpose of promoting his own happiness and well-being, but is there not something beyond that? Surely in the moral and intellectual world, we will not be content to state the rule that we are so to use our own as to make the most of it for ourselves. Self-advancement and development are good things, but they are not the highest

things. Each one certainly owes something to his fellows, but the question of difficulty is, "What and How Much?" Does the maxim of the common law apply here also? Are we here so to use our own as not to injure another? Upon its face again this seems a just and not difficult limitation, but what does it involve? Is it a practical and practicable test? May the business man, in these days of intense competition, when each man seems compelled to strain every effort to succeed, apply to himself the rule that he is to use his talents, his opportunities, his superior energy, his powers of organization and control, in such a way that he will not injure another? May he not legitimately say that this rule is well enough in the moral field, but that it will not do as a rule of business? May he not say that the greater part of the profit which he is striving so hard to acquire must be made at the expense of some one else,—that competition is so bitter as not to leave enough for all, and that each man must look out for himself, leaving every other man to do likewise?

May not the lawyer, intent upon the winning of causes, say that for him, too, the rule is too severe for practicable application;—that it is his duty to his client, as well as to himself, to do everything that can legally be done to advance his client's interest, leaving the opposing counsel to do the same for his client, and the judge to see that, between the efforts of both, in some way justice shall be evolved, and that if it is not, it is simply the fault of the system which like all things human must sometimes miscarry? If you say to him that it is his duty to his fellow man to see that by his talent, his energy, his technical astuteness, he does not further the cause of injustice, may he not properly say to you that with that he has nothing whatever to do,—that his domain is practical and

not abstract justice,—that law is one thing and morals another?

If you say to the strong man, whose appetites and passions are completely under his control, that he should not indulge in even the moderate enjoyment of his tastes or appetites in certain directions, because his brother man, who is not so strong as he, in attempting to follow his example, will be unable to restrain himself, and will bring disgrace and ruin upon himself and family;—if you say this, may he not properly reply, What is that to me? Am I to deny myself that which gives me pleasure and does me no harm simply because that weak fool cannot restrain himself? May he not legitimately ask of you, Am I my brother's keeper?

If you say to the woman absorbed in fashionable pursuits, that she ought not to so fully indulge her love for pleasure and display, lest she tempt some other woman, by her example, to foolish, wasteful, or, perchance, wicked practices, in her attempts to follow it—may she not also say, Am I my sister's keeper? Am I to restrain that love of pleasure and that delight in the beautiful which were given me by the Creator, and in which I find so much happiness, simply because some other woman, for whom these things were not intended, may permit herself to go astray?

If you say even to the thinker:—“However strong may be your reasoning faculties, however confident you may be of the absolute truth of your own conclusions, there are subjects upon which you would do well not to be too positive in your assertions or too loud or public in your attacks;—there are beliefs which others hold dear that you may properly let alone;—lest you deceive some weaker brother by leading him to abandon ancient faiths only to find that he has not the strength to climb to your vaunted heights;—if you say this to

him, may he not appropriately reply to you that the truth is never to be concealed, and that it is better for his brother to perish in his unbelief than to continue longer in those ancient errors? And in any event, may he not say like the others, *Am I my brother's keeper?*

If you say to any person, in any situation, that in the matter of his choice of an occupation, his habits, his recreations and the general conduct of his life, he owes duties above and beyond his purely legal obligations, to see that in none of these concerns shall he so use his own powers and liberties as to do injury to others, may he not also say that these are matters of purely personal interest as to which he owes duties to no one but himself?

And how are these questions to be answered? *Am I*, in any sense, to be made subject to such voluntary restrictions? May I not legitimately and properly use my powers, my liberty, in any direction which promises to afford me the greatest success and happiness, without considering whether my brother does or does not mistake my example to his own hurt? Is it not enough for me that my motives meet with my own approval, and that what I do results in no harm to me, and that I leave to my brother the same privileges and responsibilities? "*Am I my brother's keeper?*"

This is an old question. It is as old as the race. Cain asked it, and in all ages since, men, sometimes Cains, and sometimes saints, have continued to ask it. It has been often asked as it then was, as an escape from personal responsibility for an acknowledged wrong, and it has often been asked, as I would have us ask it to-day, by men conscious of no wrong, but desiring simply to discover the full measure of their responsibility to their fellows. It has received various answers; the

Cains have always answered it in the negative; the earnest, conscientious men have always answered it in the affirmative, and so it must be always answered. If there be a fatherhood of God, and a brotherhood of man, then each man is to some extent his brother's keeper. "We that are strong," said St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans, "ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." "Let every one of us please his neighbor for his good to edification." But more to the point, still, is this other rule of his, which may serve as an answer to many of our inquiries: "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything, whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak."

We may then, I think, conclude that our old legal maxim may have an application in this field. We are here so to use our own as not to injure another.

But is this a full statement of the obligation? This is but a negative statement. Is there not an affirmative one? I do not like these negative limitations. They savor of restraints externally applied, while limitations on the moral actions ought to come only from within. Moral rules, too, ought to be positive. They ought to be equivalent to a command. Instead of saying, Thou shalt not, there should be an ever present voice, too loud and too authoritative to be ignored or disobeyed, saying to us continually, Thou shalt. The old Hebrew commandments were negative: Thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not covet; thou shalt not bear false witness, and the like; but when the great Lawgiver came, he wiped away all these prohibitions, excellent as they were, and in their place He put that one great affirmative rule, which includes these all and more: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another."

In the presence of such a rule, how shallow seem the maxims of the law! Into what half truths, and partial statements, do they shrink! A *new* commandment I give unto you, that ye *love* one another. Not that we simply refrain from unnecessary injury; not that we so use our own as merely not to injure another; not that we render unto every one his legal due. We are to do more,—there is to be something spontaneous, full and generous. It is not to be limited by any rules, but is to be the voluntary outpouring of the heart overflowing with good will and love for others.

How much this rule of love involves may well be recalled to our minds in those familiar words of St. Paul as given in the new version: “Love suffereth long, and is kind: love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself; is not puffed up, doth not behave unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, taketh not account of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things. Love never faileth.”

Our human rules of conduct never raise us to this plane. We are neither long suffering nor kind, we envy others, we vaunt our own performances, we are puffed up with our own conceits, we behave unseemly, we constantly seek our own, we are easily provoked, we take account of evil; we bear little, we believe little, we endure little. Love never fails, but our human rules and standards fail constantly. Love anticipates the demand for justice; under our human rules justice has to be enforced. With all of our great and constantly growing mass of laws; with all of our complicated and expensive system of machinery; with all of our great army of lawyers and judges, the most that we can accomplish is confessedly a tardy, partial and expensive kind of human justice.

How incalculable the pecuniary gain if we could but substitute this rule of love for our imperfect and inefficient human rules; but more than that, what a gain in peace and good will, what a wealth of kindliness and happiness, what an era for all mental, moral and physical progress and development.

Is the rule impractical? Is it good in theory but not in practice? Does it savor of a weak and effeminate sentimentalism? So we are often told. But has it ever been fairly tried? There was One who tried it and lost his life by it. But was that necessarily the sign of failure? "He that loveth his life," He said, "shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

Judged by this rule that life was not a failure. For eighteen hundred years, the conviction has grown stronger and more universal, that instead of failure it was the highest kind of success—the type, in truth, of the only kind of success. It has fixed the standard of performance, and in all the succeeding years men, in constantly increasing numbers, have recognized it as at once the object of their hope and their despair, until to-day, in all the civilized regions of the globe, under various forms, with different ceremonies, but every where with the same common purpose, the great majority of the race is, at this very hour, engaged in contemplating anew the matchless excellence of the example set and in renewing its determination still more fully to work it into life.

Is it then too vain a hope, too optimistic an illusion that this rule of love shall yet prevail? It would not be if each one would see that as to him it did prevail. That does not seem so difficult a matter, but it is an undertaking which has thus far proved too great or has been approached with too weak a purpose.

Shall we then despair? Shall we acknowledge the weakness of the position and give over our efforts to maintain it? Let us rather see clearly that to make this rule prevail among men is the ultimate end and destiny of the race; that to this end all true progress tends; that whatever makes for this, either with the individual or the race, is alone important; and without faltering and without despairing, let us follow the "Eternal which makes for Righteousness."

THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON.

BY PROF B. M. THOMPSON.

Delivered May 21, 1893.

The unquestioned purpose of this parable was to indicate the relation in which man stands to his Creator. Christ likens it here, as he has done elsewhere, to the relation between father and son.

It would seem from the context that this parable was related to an assembly made up largely of publicans and sinners, a class forming in that age, and, perhaps, in every age since, even to our own time, a majority of every assembly brought together by mere chance or idle curiosity. Jesus had, perhaps, been urging his hearers to repent, to cease to do evil and learn to do good, to refrain from violating the immutable laws which govern the spiritual world. He had, perhaps, emphasized the truth that obedience to those laws alone makes for happiness, and that disobedience necessarily and inevitably results in misery. Most of his hearers could, from their personal experience probably, testify to the truth of this doctrine. But, they might naturally ask, if we determine to do better hereafter, what will it avail us? Since we are being punished for past transgressions of the law, if we cease to transgress will the punishment cease? It was to answer such questions that, maybe, the parable was given, to make clear that, while a violation of the law is punished, one violation does not make a second necessary, that disobedience may be followed by obedi-

ence, and that obedience, even when lagging behind disobedience will be encouraged and blessed, that the angels rejoice over a sinner who repents.

To understand its full force and meaning we must place ourselves in the position of the persons to whom this parable was told ; surround ourselves with the social, political and religious laws and influences that hedged them in. Under the Mosaic law the father remained at the head of the household until his death, lawgiver, judge and priest. The command to obey father and mother was not confined to persons under twenty-one years of age, but rested upon all who had father or mother. When Isaac at the command of Abraham went with him to the mount to be offered as a sacrifice, he was not a youth, a stripling, but a mature man forty years of age and upwards. The entire earnings of the joint family belonged to the father as long as he lived, to be disposed of at his pleasure. Upon his death it was divided under fixed and definite laws governing the distribution of estates of inheritance. Those laws gave the father a right to dispose of a portion of his estate by will. But no son had a right to any of the family property during the life-time of his father, and it was his duty to remain under the control and direction of that father.

All those laws and customs were perfectly familiar to those who listened to this parable. They understood that this younger son had no right to a portion of his father's living and no right to be emancipated from his father's control. Indeed, that so far as the law and filial duty were concerned, he was required to remain in his father's household, subject to his father's commands. It was, therefore, plain to them that when the younger son made the request, " give me the portion

of goods that falleth to me," it implied a desire on his part to be emancipated from parental control, from the law governing the Hebrew household, and that when the father assented, divided his living, he really emancipated his son and gave him permission and authority to gather all together and to depart, "not many days after," into a far country. It was thus plain to them that this young man stood in the same relation to his parental inheritance that every man holds with reference to the gifts he has received from his Maker, a free agent to do, or not to do, as he wills.

What this young man did in that far country is presumably what he intended to do from the first, he wasted his substance in riotous living. Why anyone should deliberately enter upon a course of life which he knows begins in folly and ends in ruin, we do not stop to consider. The curious in such matters can readily enquire of the first prodigal they meet. You will find that he is not necessarily vicious, but he is always lawless and destitute of self discipline and self control, or, if he possesses those powers, he suffers them to slumber. He is as regardless of the future as the savage who, if his wigwam is to-day supplied with food, eats and sleeps, arises and eats again, heedless of the fact that when his casual guest, plenty, shall depart, his old and habitual companions, hunger and want, will again take their places at his board. And thus the prodigal of the parable continued to waste and squander his portion until it all disappeared and then he went and joined himself to a citizen of that distant and alien country and fed swine, became the herder of unclean beasts, was filthy and ragged and withal hungry and no man gave unto him, so that at last he gladly shared with the hogs the husks they ate. With most prodigals feeding swine and eating husks is not fol-

lowed by anything better. They continue in that condition for a period and then comes a time when for them there are no more swine to feed, no more husks even to eat and they must needs miserably perish in that far-off country. They never come to themselves from the beginning to the end of their folly. But this prodigal came to himself and said, "I will arise and go to my father," and, apparently, he gave no further thought to swine and the husks that swine eat.

As the prodigal was returning, his father saw him a great way off and ran to meet him and fell upon his neck and kissed him, brought him into the house and put shoes upon his feet, a robe upon his shoulders and a ring upon his hand, thus announcing that he was not a servant but a son and must be so regarded and treated. And then the father directs a feast to be made and commands that they kill the fatted calf. What a noble, generous and forgiving father had this prodigal son and such a father in heaven, this parable clearly teaches, have all the sons of men. But the theologian dwells more upon the cordial reception which this son received, than the lawyer is inclined to do. The lawyer's attention is called away from the feasting, the rejoicing, the father's gladness, to the condition, the legal condition, of the prodigal himself. He had come to himself and was again under his father's roof in his right mind, recognized as a son, wearing the insignia of heirship, a robe upon his shoulders and a ring upon his hand, but what was he heir to? He had already received his portion and had wasted it in that far-off country, strewn it over the fields and along the hedge rows while sowing his wild oats. That portion was all gone, not even a husk from his last meal remained. What then was left? A loving father, sonship, heirship, a warm welcome. This was very much, but the

share of the living, which had been divided at his request, what of that? The parable leaves us in no doubt. The father says to the elder son explicitly, "All that I have is thine. We are not rejoicing because we have an opportunity to divide our living again. What is here is yours. Your brother was lost and is found, was dead and is alive again, therefore we rejoice."

It does not appear that a single farthing was given to this young man. Certainly not a farthing of the portion wasted could be returned to him, and he had no claim whatever upon the elder brother's portion. He was as poor as ever. There was given him an opportunity to share perhaps in future savings. I am aware that the theologian takes a more hopeful view of the prodigal's situation and the theologian may be right. But assuredly it does not by any means appear clear from this parable that any prodigal who has wasted his love of truth, justice, virtue and decency in riotous living, has fed the unclean swine of depraved human passions and gladly filled his belly with the husks of sin, can by coming to himself and going to his father have the precious gifts of an innocent heart and a pure soul restored to him for the asking and not as a reward for a victory achieved after a long and weary battle. If one walks into the fire and is burned, nature, a kind, and forgiving mother, will assuage the pain and heal the wounds, but a scar remains—and yet the power and goodness of the Almighty may not be measured with a yard stick.

SACRED MUSIC.

PROF. A. A. STANLEY.

Delivered June 4, 1893.

Christianity has been termed not so much a religion as a revelation of the nature of God, and an unfolding of the purpose of a life held up as the ideal life towards which all lives should turn.

The fullness of the revelation was made possible for three reasons. First, it supplemented and infused new life into the truth which formed the bases of preceding religions, notably Judaism. Second, it came at a time when the longing for immortality found expression in a philosophy which hinted at that which was now clearly revealed. Third, it was a revelation of man to himself. It thus rested upon all that was best in the old religions. It stimulated and gave new direction to exalted aspiration. It emphasized the importance of man, and revealed to him the true reason for his desire to express through the medium of art many of his finer feelings.

The feeling for the beautiful, one of the purest attributes of the soul, found in this new and more complete revelation of God, a fullersatisfaction than had been given by any preceding religion. Among other expressions of the beautiful we find music. It may be confidently asserted that the possibilities of so subjective an art as music, could never have been developed, had there been no great uplifting of the soul

—such an advancement of ideals as directly resulted from the teachings of Christianity.

As soon as Christianity became the accepted religion, among the many questions of ceremonial observance came that of church music. Three of the earlier Popes, Sylvester, Ambrose and Gregory stand out in bold relief in this connection. Sylvester by his singing schools laid the foundation upon which Ambrose and Gregory reared the structure of Ambrosian and Gregorian song. Properly two independent structures were erected by these men, for the Ambrosian chant with its strongly marked metrical structure differs radically from the slowly moving—non-rhythmical—Gregorian tone. We discover in these two opposing conceptions of the nature of sacred song, the reasons for the two types of church music, which have from that time up to the present day, divided church musicians. The one conception may be observed in the ordinary hymn tune, the other in the German choral.

The inevitable clashing of these fundamentally opposing types of song gave rise to many bitter controversies. These controversies finally resulted in a division of the church in so far as the musical service was concerned. Thus we find at the beginning of the church's history that the problem which confronts us today was considered one of the most important questions pressing for an answer, and that although the conditions differ, the essential points at issue are identical.

That appropriate music is an aid to worship is well nigh universally admitted. That music formed a part of all the ceremonies of the religion of ancient peoples, that the character of the music employed at such ceremonies was discussed by philosophers, goes to prove that while the power of music to

express religion aspiration was recognized, it was distinctly understood that religious music differed from secular. All this proves no less forcibly that the converse proposition that inappropriate music is a hindrance to devotion, must also be true. Historically we find that the various councils of the church recognized these truths, and acrimonious discussions raged on these occasions, the question as to what was appropriate in church music evidently causing as much dissension as any of the theological controversies. At the council of Trent we find the question had assumed such importance that the art music (as the elaborate musical forms created by the Netherlandic school were called) was on trial and stood in danger of being entirely swept out of the church by the reactionary party which called for return to the old Gregorian chant. Strangely enough the Catholic church is in the midst of a similar agitation at the present time.

The masses in use at that time were extremely complicated and utterly devoid of inspiration. As a matter of fact the people took no interest in the music, and accompanied the singing of the masses by ribald songs, and all sorts of blasphemous interpolations. Thus the act of worship had been degraded to a veritable saturnalia. That this revolt of the church dignitaries was timely will be admitted by all. Musicians are particularly interested in this council, for in the course of the discussion Palestrina's music was formally declared to be the purest model of church song. Thus the canons of sacred music were authoritatively decided for the Catholic church. Following out these canons we find that sacred music must possess distinct and individual characteristics, harmonically, melodically and rhythmically. These differences, clearly defined in Palestrina's time became somewhat obliterated by the

change from the so called church modes to our modern tonalities, and were lost sight of almost entirely during the formative period of the oratorio and opera. These two forms had at the beginning so much in common, that we are not surprised to find in the music of so great a composer as Handel, but little difference between his religious and secular styles. This remark applies more particularly to the solo parts, for in his oratorio choruses we discern that nobility and dignity of style, which comports with the expression of exalted religious sentiment. Handel recognized the fact that the oratorio calls for the most sustained musical thought. "The Messiah," "Israel in Egypt," "Judas Maccabeus" and "Samson" are the fruits of his ripened genius, and the expressions of the sturdy religious conviction of the man's life.

Handel by his training as an opera composer, and by his life as a man of the world, was more dominated by conventionalities, and less fitted to set up authoritative standards of musical structure in the field of sacred music than Bach, whose genius was more reflective, and whose nature was more introspective and devout. While we admit the greatness of Handel's "Messiah," Bach's cantatas, chorals and notably his Passion Music must be cited as the purest examples of sacred music extant. In these works we meet with a style totally distinct from any secular music. His music is however founded upon polyphony and is too complicated for general use. This style is the same as that dominating Palestrina's masses, and by its very nature is more in consonance with the dignified Gregorian chant, of which it is the fruit. The very nature of polyphonic music is opposed to that metrical regularity, which while it underlies rhythm of the highest type, is at the same time responsible for the musical forms which are in essence,

not alone secular, but vulgar. The Passion Music of Bach will undoubtedly ever stand as the sublimest expression of sacred music human genius has ever conceived, a worthy and ideal interpretation of that pathetic story of suffering. Such music is, however, beyond the ordinary chorus and impossible for the congregation.

The chorals of the Lutheran church are suited to the capacity of the ordinary congregation, and are as worthy of respect in their limited field as is the Passion Music in its wider sphere. These melodies, in many instances, were derived from folk-songs, and this fact may account for their popularity in those countries which possess rich treasures of these songs of the people. These folk-songs were many of them derived from the so-called sequences, which were extended vocal passages emphasizing the importance of the word Alleluia in the Gregorian chant. These folk-songs preserved the character of that religious chant, (which contained the germs of our modern music,) and were, therefore, admirably adapted for use in the service of the church. Again, many of these folk-songs were incorporated into the ritual of the Catholic church, as for example, the "Stabat Mater," "Dies Irae," etc. The music to these songs was often full of pathos, and was more often grave than gay. In fact, the melodies themselves seemed to be more suitable for the church than for any other use. The beautiful choral "O, Sacred Heart, Once Wounded," was originally a folk-song. All of them partook of the measured dignity of the Gregorian chant.

We must bear in mind that we have standards which should assist us in arriving at helpful conclusions, and to which we may confidently appeal. We may, in addition to the canons of musical composition (which cover the whole ques-

tion,) refer to the standard of appropriateness, which Ruskin calls "the golden corner-stone of architecture."

Two factors are introduced at the present time which make a consideration of the subject somewhat difficult: 1. The lack of musical cultivation on the part of the majority of church-goers. 2. The absence of uniformity in the public worship. Those who possess a limited degree of musical cultivation are most impressed by the very elements in music which are in essence most opposed to the dignity of sacred music. This is unfortunately the case in persons of intelligence, highly cultivated in other directions, who would be repelled by a literary work, or possibly a painting of the same grade as the musical compositions which are in actual use in many of our churches. The absence of uniformity in our church worship, in itself, may not be to blame for the many flagrant sins against good taste which occur so often in our services, but it is incidentally responsible. In a liturgical service, based upon the church year, the average church music director cannot go far astray. He may select poor music—as a matter of fact, he does very often—but he is not likely to cause music of a joyful nature to be sung on Good Friday, neither would he give music appropriate to that day on Easter. Throughout the whole year he has a guide in the liturgy, and the fact that the important Canticles, which afford the principal opportunity for the choir, are integral parts of the service, which must be read if they are not sung, makes flagrant transgressions against fitness well-nigh impossible. Again, the musical service of all liturgical churches has been enriched by a large and varied repertoire of choice settings of the Canticles and scriptural texts, by composers who, like Dr. Dykes, were priests in the church as well as musicians, or, like Sullivan, Barnby and Stainer, have

become thoroughly permeated by the spirit of the church.

Every liturgical church has numerous musical traditions which have been maintained by generations of organists and choir-masters, who are thoroughly convinced of the correctness of the principles underlying the musical expressions of those ideas which the worthy and dignified religious service should inspire.

The liturgical churches are not held up as models from a denominational standpoint, at all, but simply as an illustration of the fact that in order to secure absolute harmony in the service, that all parts may be mutually helpful, it is necessary to have some definite plan to which all that contributes to the service shall conform. If the musical taste of a congregation is to be elevated, it is necessary to determine how the ideal church music may be introduced.

Music which upon a critical analysis can be shown to be dance music pure and simple, which in its arrangements of themes, its rhythms, the scheme of harmonies employed, can be assigned a definite musical dance form—cannot be divested of that musical character by the addition of religious poetry.

The character of the subject would not alter the structure of the sonnet, in so far as the number of lines enters into its analysis. A waltz is something more than a graceful, rhythmical “swing.” That element is an important one, and aids in distinguishing between a waltz and a polka; but the arrangement of themes, the grouping of measures, are just as important, and more decisive as to the form than the rhythm. Now if an analysis of a piece of music shows it to be a dance, its place is in the ball-room. All dance forms appeal to the sense of rhythm primarily, and ordinarily this sense is the lowest in the scale of musical appreciation. This fact makes such music unworthy

of association with such exalted truths as underlie religion. The fact that people like such music is no argument, or at least a trivial one. A majority of the human race would be willing to remain in ignorance, were there no such thing as an ideal life held up before them. The church should be one of the greatest educators of mankind, and should stimulate ideals.

Music which has become associated with the theatre, the beer-garden, or even with emotions holy in themselves—as romantic love—can never be used effectively in church worship. The more perfectly music expresses non-religious feelings, the less adapted it is for the church. Many of the most popular hymn tunes of the last generation, (“Lischer,” “Thou Dear Redeemer, Dying Lamb,”) have been sung as drinking songs in Germany for a generation or more. In our adaptation from the German folk-songs we have almost invariably selected the type which has the most decided metrical accent and passed by the substantial chorals. A love song like Ascher’s “Alice” remains a love song even when sung to “I would not live away.” These examples are not quoted to belittle the subject, but to point out the absurdity of many of our adaptations.

The introduction of the organ into this country was not effected without considerable friction. The liturgical churches favored the use of the instrument as an aid to worship. The non-liturgical churches disapproved of the instrument, as they feared it would prove a “disturber of the peace.” The prophetic instinct of these churches has been largely justified in these latter days, for the organ has been used in the services in many instances with an utter disregard of the fitness of things.

The whole idea of the ordinary opening and closing voluntary is repugnant to any possessor of cultivated taste. The

worship should begin with the first note of the organ, and the final act of worship should be the close of the Postlude. Is it so? May we not begin at this point and throw out some hints as to the proper use of the various parts of the musical service.

In a liturgical service the prelude is short, and by virtue of tradition, dignified, massive, and is intended to cover the interval of time consumed by the rector in finding the lesson for the day, etc., in the service book. If a processional is sung, the prelude merges into this and is thus even more truly a part of the service. If the prelude is trivial or irreverent, the organist in such a church deserves no mercy, for he sins against great light. In many churches the voluntary is very often a more or less pretentious piece of music, having no connection with that which follows, even if it seems to introduce an anthem by the choir or the doxology by the congregation. It may be an arrangement from "Carmen" or a movement from an organ sonata. If it is a dignified, worshipful introduction to that which follows, it is artistic, judged by musical criticism, and in that church the first step has been taken in the direction of an ideal service.

If the anthem which follows is an appropriate introduction to the line of thought which is to dominate the preaching service, it is generally an accident. If the choir director is a good musician—one who appreciates the true mission of music—the composition is devotional; if not, it may be some flippant production of the day, or an arrangement of some melody which would be debarred from the church by the application of critical standards. It may be a showy solo for the tenor or soprano. If the members of the congregation are not exceptionally cultivated or anxious to become so, the showy solo will surely come unless its place is taken by some weakly, sentimental

absurdity like "Where is my wandering boy to-night?"

The hymn tune comes next in order. An enumeration of the hymns which have fitting tunes written expressly for them, will show conclusively that two-thirds of the hymns in the average hymnal have no value as hymns. It may seem an exaggeration (but the statement can be verified) that the number of hymns adapted to the church musical worship does not exceed two hundred. Three hundred years ago the first chapter of St. Matthew was set to music, but the setting of sermons to music has since then become a lost art, and didactic hymns are avoided by the composer. All such hymns should be eliminated. They are practically, for they are never sung. The versification of hymns is often so defective that the musician can not but be repelled by them. To be sure, many of these hymns may be very effectively used in anthem form, but these remarks apply more particularly to the hymns which are sung by the congregation. There should be no other settings in church. All the blame must not attach to the poet, for the musician who composes a tune full of chromatic harmonies, difficult intonation and extended compass sins against good taste. Chromatic harmonies are associated with the expression of the passionate in music, and the difficult intonation and extended range make it impossible to insist upon the one condition which is imperative if good congregational singing is desired. This condition is that the congregation must sing the melody. No one has the faintest idea of perfect congregational singing who has not heard a large number of people singing in unison. This grand body of tone—a noble composite voice—in which all the deficiencies and roughness of single voices is absorbed—is sustained by the varied harmonies of an adequate organ. The time may never come when a congregation can

hope to sing successfully in parts until an ideal existence is ours.

The lack of harmony in many of our church services is condoned by the statement that everything musical which precedes the long prayer, has no particular connection with the sermon. The long prayer appears to stand between the two opposing parts, and reconciles them in a measure. Such a conception of church worship can hardly be called ideal—and why should there not be an ideal church service?

The first essential in securing an ideal form of worship, is a perfect understanding between the pastor and the director of the music. If there is not such an understanding, if there is no prearranged plan, if the director has no idea of the sermon, (the understanding should go as far as that), or at least of the general trend of the service, no one should be blamed if the most absurd combinations should result. If he cannot enter into the spirit of the service after such sympathetic explanations, he should not be retained.

The question of authority is a troublesome factor, for in most cases the pastor is the one who decides upon the fitness of things. In most cases he is assisted by a music committee generally appointed as a sort of compensation for a conspicuous want of knowledge of the subject. The possession of authority should be accompanied by a disposition to fit oneself to exercise such authority judiciously and understandingly. How many pastors attempt to learn enough about sacred music to be intelligent critics, safe guides, and above all possessors of absolute authority? A movement in the right direction has already been made in the Hartford Theological Seminary by the establishment of a chair of sacred music.

The perfect understanding between pastor and chorister existing, the ideal service becomes possible.

This mutual relation would, if both were courageous and honest, eliminate the false and debasing Moody and Sankey music—under which title all Gospel Hymns may be grouped. Church music has gone backward wherever this music has been introduced to any extent. The typical Gospel Hymn occupies the same relation to dignified and worthy church music that the “blood and thunder” novel does to literature. In the end no good can result from its retention. No self-respecting musician can afford to condone it, for to endorse it is to go contrary to one’s artistic conscience. If music is to occupy its proper position in the church, the best cannot be too good and there should be no place for music of a low grade.

In the ideal service the music will be an integral part of the service in the non-liturgical as well as in the liturgical church. The highest type of music only will be allowed within the walls of the sacred edifice. The people will not like such music at first, but they must be made to like it. To aid this the organist should give recitals of the best organ music. The people should meet together occasionally, as a chorus, to practice singing hymns and it would not be long before the members of such a church would enjoy singing the grand old chorals and music which like these grand melodies breathes the spirit of true devotion, as they never did the undignified, trashy hymn tunes of the last generation. The people in such a church would look back upon many of the musical practices of the present with astonishment.

To establish the ideal church service will require patience, time and money. This ideal may come in your day. It may come very soon, it may be delayed; but the time is surely coming when all I have hinted at will be accomplished and every church service will be ideal.

THE RIGHT OF DISSENT WITHIN THE CHURCH.

PROF. F. M. TAYLOR.

Delivered May 21, 1893.

To the very respectable class of persons who in our materialistic age still believe that God is and that man has a nature and destiny which involve personal relations with God, who believe, therefore, that churches still have a mission in the world,—to all such one of the most interesting questions of the day is this, How shall the Church, with its ideas and practices inherited from a former age, adjust itself to the spirit and beliefs of our own? For some process of adjustment is evidently necessary. The discrepancy between the two is real and sufficiently obvious. It is of course conceivable that men will cling to the older ideas in spite of their want of harmony with current thinking. These ideas were to the Greeks, i. e., to the scientific men, even in Paul's day, "foolishness." Yet they mastered the world. The admitted impossibility of subjecting the realm of religion to the processes by which knowledge is perfected in other fields leaves room for faith to roam without conscious conflict with one's general intellectual spirit and method. Nevertheless, the maintenance of such a dualistic thought-life always involves considerable difficulty, and certainly an increasingly large number of persons are ceasing to attempt it. For one cause or another, disbelief in what the so-called evangelical churches look upon as essential, is widely prevalent among those who still cling to a minimum of religious

faith and who desire to be accounted Christians. An impartial observer can scarcely doubt that this disbelief has come to stay. What is going to be done with it? What shall be done with a dissent which has become settled and substantially ineradicable?

To this question there are three chief answers. First, it is proposed formally to abolish all creeds, to leave to each member unlimited liberty of opinion. This would practically do away with dissent, since dissent implies an authoritative creed to dissent from. As our topic this morning is Dissent, we are not primarily concerned with this method of meeting the difficulty in question. We may touch upon it incidentally.

A second and more widely advocated method for the disposal of dissent is to preserve rigidly the ancient shibboleths and insist that the dissenter pursue the only natural and honorable course of withdrawing from the church in which he is a dissenter and find or organize a society adapted to his views and needs. The consideration of this solution like the preceding does not properly belong to our task; for our topic is Dissent *within, not outside*, the church.

The third answer to the question, what shall be done with dissent, proposes that the churches shall tacitly recognize a limited right of dissent *within* the organization, resorting to liberal interpretation, mental reservations, and similar devices to secure the necessary stretching of the boundaries.

It is hardly necessary to remark that this third solution of the difficulty is that which is being gradually adopted in actual practice. It commends itself to the opportunist spirit, to the tolerant disposition, to the desire for peace, and to the patriotic anxiety to maintain the prestige of numbers and wealth. As the *New York Nation* remarked a few years ago, we have passed the age of "come-outers"; we have reached that of the "stay-inners."

It is undoubtedly too late for any considerable increase in the number of sects. On the other hand, it is too early to look for the adoption of the no-creed policy. It is indeed doubtful whether such a plan will ever commend itself to practical men. A church is not a university or an academy of science. It is a practical organization having objects, the successful prosecution of which depends in large measure on unity of opinion, spirit, and method. In any case the solution demanding our attention is that which grants a right of dissent *within* the church. This proposal we have to consider briefly in two aspects; viz., the justice of such a course, and its expediency.

First, then, is it just that the doubting member should claim and the church grant a limited right of dissent? Is there in reason any ground for asserting the reality of such a right? Here, of course, we are speaking not of a legal but of a moral right. Now, it is highly probable that to a great many persons the assertion of a right of dissent within the church seems almost a contradiction in terms. "Grace," they would say "is surely the utmost that the dissenter can ask. Some sort of case might have been made out when there was but one church and when membership in it was compulsory. But now, when the organization is purely voluntary, if a man comes to reject the standards of the body to which he belongs, he surely can make no just claim to stay in the church. In joining, he relinquished his right to think for himself on certain defined subjects. He agreed to think in accord with certain definite formulae. When he can no longer do so with a good conscience, his course is plain. He should get out and go where his views are in accord with the standards." It is even urged that there is something positively dishonorable in trying to stick to the church under such conditions. Especially is this

declared to be true if one is an authorized teacher or preacher. His insisting upon a right to stay is stigmatized as even dishonest. His appointment was given him that he might teach or preach the particular doctrines approved by the organization as a whole. The money which supports him is usually given with that understanding. He is almost an embezzler.

It is worthy of note that this position is taken not merely by church authorities, who may be presumed to be prejudiced parties; it is maintained as well by the outside public, by the secular press, by men quite in sympathy with the dissenter, by men who could scarcely find a church sufficiently liberal to let them in. "A church," they say "is like any other organization. It has a will and an opinion determined and declared by certain defined processes. Of course it is legitimate for any member to endeavor to alter the decisions of this will in accord with his own opinion through the regularly appointed means. But, when this fails, when the decision goes against him, plainly there is nothing left but to get out."

These views are of course familiar. All have heard them many times. It is seldom that the opposite side is presented. It is doubtless assumed by most that there is no other side. Yet it is highly improbable that there is nothing to be said for the "stay-inner." The above reasoning is of great weight, but it does not wholly exhaust the case. Upon all such reasoning the chief criticism to be made is that it implies a conception of organizations, especially of church organizations, decidedly too mechanical. It implies that church relations are formed with perfect freedom and with full comprehension of all the limitations involved. It implies that such relations, once formed, create no rights, moral claims, or obligations save those nominated in the bond. It implies that those relations

can be severed without inconvenience, and that the severing of those relations puts a man back exactly where he was when they were formed. Now, are these implications warranted? Let us consider some reasons for a contrary opinion.

In the first place, am I estopped from dissent because in entering the organization, I, with *full, conscious* freedom choose this particular church in preference to all others? Surely a negative answer only is possible. Nine-tenths of the members of the great evangelical churches have joined under conditions almost wholly precluding any such free, conscious, responsible action. For, first, of a large number of church members it may be said with scarcely any misuse of language that they are *born* into the church. Their parents are members and make it their duty and their pleasure to treat the child as did the Jews of old. From the very cradle he is devoted to the Lord. While yet a babe in arms, he is baptized. As soon as he can walk, he is put into the Sunday School. When revival meetings occur, he is encouraged, even urged, to take a stand on the side of religion. Nowadays he is frequently taken into formal relations with the church before he has reached his tenth year. Almost always he joins while still a minor, while still thought of as unfit to bear the responsibilities of citizenship, to settle the petty questions as to who shall be mayor or councilman or path-master; and yet he is asserted to be able with full, conscious freedom to decide whether or not he believes in the trinity, in the doctrine of divine sovereignty, in the inerrancy of scriptures, in the final impenitence of the wicked, in a host of dogmas fit for the consideration of only the ablest and maturest minds. Now, when at some future time some such person objects to a part of the church's doctrine or discipline, will it be just fair to say to

him, "My brother, when you joined the church you formally consented in the presence of God and his people to abide by its rules, you freely assented to its doctrines. You alone are responsible for the position in which you find yourself. You must in good faith abide by the vows you then took or withdraw from the church." Surely such words are little short of mockery.

But, is the case materially different with older people who get into the church at a later period of life? Not greatly; especially not with the class of persons who make trouble as dissenters from the church's doctrine and discipline. Some are urged so persistently and strongly that they have no intelligent freedom in the matter. Some are practically wheedled in. A considerable number enter the church with a definite understanding between themselves and the pastor that mental reservations are expected. The history of many a case would read something like this. The pastor solicits the person in question to come and take his stand with the church. The person solicited admits his sense of the need of religion and his general sympathy with Christian people but urges his disbelief in certain accepted doctrines or his objection to certain rules of discipline. The pastor, thereupon, assures him that these are not essential matters; that no two of the clergy even, understand the tenets of theology in the same sense; that in the opinion of the pastor matters of private conduct must be determined by each according to the dictates of his own conscience. Whereupon the solicited one concludes to accept the invitation. Please do not imagine this a fancy sketch. I know whereof I speak. I know a young man who entered into active relations in an evangelical church in this city, after having explicitly informed the pastor that he did not believe

in Jesus Christ as a savior, and after having been told by the pastor that the latter did not consider such faith essential. I have known other similar cases. Surely no one can fairly say that in cases like these the member is estopped from later dissent because when he entered he consciously accepted the obnoxious doctrines. Yet such men are just the sort that will be dissenters by and by. But, even if there is no such understanding between the pastor and the candidate that he will be allowed considerable latitude, there is seldom that clear, definite acceptance of the standards of the church which would justify representing that the man is by his own act fully responsible for the plight in which he finds himself.

But the ordinary method of reasoning about the duty of the dissenter looks at the church too mechanically not only in speaking of joining as if it were a perfectly free process, it commits the same error in treating the church relation as if it had no power to bring into existence rights and obligations not expressly nominated in the bond. This way of looking at the matter makes the rights of the member in the church entirely the creation of its fundamental law. He has no claims upon his brethren save under and in accord with that law. Now, this is utterly irrational. It is not possible for men to occupy toward one another any relation whatsoever without, by that very fact and barring the express terms of their articles of association, bringing into existence mutual rights and obligations. The most commonplace organization, a tennis club, or a debating society, involves manifold relations and reciprocal claims beside those formulated in a written constitution. How much more then a church, the very body of Christ. If the church is at all what Christ meant it to be, its communicants have become members one of another, in the mystic language

of Paul, have become one even as Christ and the Father are one. Years of association in the Church's activities, blessed hours spent together in worship of prayer and song, seasons of sorrow when they have wept together, days of joy when they have seen the coming of the glory of the Lord, their common heritage in the church's heroic past when their fathers fought or suffered for the faith, all these and many other forces have caused them to grow together into a union of life and heart which no instrument of association could produce. Who has not felt his heart thrill with the spirit of the Church in such songs as Faber's "Faith of our Fathers living still in spite of dungeon, fire, and sword"?

Further, the church is not only a great living organism, transcending in the unity of its life any mere temporary association, it is a powerful factor in determining all our other relations. It tends to become the organizing principle of our whole life. Let us suppose you are the son of a Presbyterian minister. You have been educated in a Presbyterian college. Some of the notable people of your church have come to think of you as a young man of promise. They are in quest of a college teacher. What more natural than that they should think of you? So, again, it is almost certain that your social relations will be determined along the same lines. It is probable that the woman you will wed has been brought up in the same church, wonted to its forms of worship, steeped in its glorious memories, almost indulging a superstitious fear that no other road to heaven is quite sure. To leave it is not merely to rend its own bonds,—perhaps the strongest and most sacred we know,—it means also the tearing of your whole life up by the roots. Now, is it not unchristian mockery to say to you, when you find yourself dissenting from an outgrown confession,

“Oh, the church is a mere organization, a religious club; if you find yourself out of harmony with it, you have only to try another.” Surely you will feel disposed to say with Newman Smyth to the American Board during the great debate on the proper requirements for missionaries, “Come what will, and do here to-day what you may, ours too are the fathers, ours is the historical faith of the church, ours is the right of the children in the evangelical work of the Christian church; and we mean to stay here, so help us God. Sirs, you can not put us out. We will not be excluded. We will not forfeit our right and our responsibility in the missionary work and the Christian church.”

We have thus seen that it is vain to deny to the member of the church any rights in the church because he has relinquished its standards. He did not so consciously renounce his right to think in entering the church as to deprive him of all right when he begins to think. But, again, even had he done so, his fellows could not justly plead that their association together had created for him no claims upon their forbearance, that they were perfectly justified in thrusting him out as one who had no rights save those contained in the instrument of association. Even if he had gone in with his eyes wide open, yet would their life together have created for him a right stronger and higher than that of the bond itself. But, doubtless, we need to speak soberly here. The rest have rights as well as he. He can not have a right to such a degree of toleration as will nullify their rights. No right of dissent can be claimed which is not quite limited in its nature.

First, the right can not properly have such recognition as will not consist with a high degree of *unity* and *harmony*. It is surely a right of the members generally that the value of

the association as a means of building them up in righteousness shall not be destroyed by bickering and dissensions. The unsettled condition of mind, the irritated feelings, the distraction from real religious exercises fitted to strengthen the character and improve the life,—these are evil results of great moment flowing from perpetual controversy. The members in general have a right to be secured against them.

Again, the right of the minority should not be so exaggerated as to involve the offensive advocacy of ideas and practices obnoxious to the majority. The claims of the latter upon the association surely deserve to be considered as well as those of the dissenter.

Furthur, the claims of the minority can not legitimately be pressed so far as to stop the proper teachers of the church from advocating those doctrines which the majority look upon as necessary or profitable for their own religious life. Undoubtedly a right of dissent largely loses its value if one must frequently listen to teachings opposed to his pet ideas. This is especially true, if the difference of opinion concern questions of practice. A man who considers it quite right under suitable conditions to play cards and go to the theater, is not likely to be satisfied with a toleration which relieves him from the danger of ecclesiastical prosecution, but still treats him to periodical sermons on the wickedness of his conduct. The case is even more serious, if he has children to listen to the denunciations of the practices of their father. All this doubtless has force, yet it would surely be unjust to assert that the majority have no right to a teaching which they think in the highest degree important for themselves and their families. Plainly we have here claims that in practice tend to conflict. The only escape is moderation. All parties should exercise it. The

majority and the minority should act with caution, and mutual forbearance. In the end, if the situation becomes too strained, it is reasonable that the dissenter should leave an organization with which he finds himself wholly out of sympathy. Just when this will be in actual life, it is not possible to say beforehand. No hard and fast rule can be laid down. The circumstances of different local churches will dictate different courses. City churches can flourish with a greater degree of diversity in opinion and practice than can churches in small villages. Association is much less intimate; the mental vision is broader; the spirit is more tolerant. In any case a degree of diversity which makes the church alike valueless to the orthodox and the dissenter is inadmissible; and, in case the conflict is irrepressible, the minority must yield.

We have considered at some length the question of the justness of recognizing a right of dissent within the church, and have argued for the existence of a *real* but *limited* right answering to that description. We have now to consider briefly the *expediency* of recognizing such a right. Under this head it will be natural to consider the expediency of recognizing such a right at all and, secondly, of recognizing it in the particular way proposed, i. e., tacitly, by liberal interpretation, mental reservation, etc.

First, then, can the church afford to permit dissent within its borders? To begin with, as was remarked earlier, the church is not a university or an academy of sciences. It does not exist for the investigation and discovery of truth, but rather for the propagation of a particular faith, and for the edification of those who have already accepted that faith. Now, can it successfully prosecute these ends and tolerate dissent? As to the second end named, i. e., the edification of members, we have

already spoken in considering the reality of the right of dissent. We have seen that that right can not claim such absoluteness as to override the right of the members in general to have an association fitted to serve them in its appointed ways. We have now to consider toleration as affecting the church's fitness for its other task,—the propagation of the faith.

Against the expediency of such toleration, it is to be said, first, that it is inconsistent with the necessary unity and compactness of the church's forces in the attack on the world of evil. Bickerings and controversies within the church will hinder its presenting a solid front to the foe. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare for the battle?" In the second place, with too much toleration, there will be a lack of definiteness and consistency in the message presented to the world. If all beliefs are allowed and their advocacy within the church permitted, the outsider will find it hard to get a clear idea of the nature of the salvation offered to him. It is difficult to resist the temptation to merriment when a council of liberal divines attempt to define what they mean by salvation. Doubtless the result is less offensive to cultured ears, especially to agnostic ears, than the revivalist's tiresome reiteration of his message "Come to Jesus and be washed from guilt and sin." But what is gained in taste and intelligibility is lost in definiteness. The man who says to the drunkard just from the gutter, "You have only to accept Jesus, who died for just such as you, and you are assured of eternal happiness. Now is your time. An hour later death may come and then your chance is gone," has a message that is about the most effective conceivable. If this sinner has to listen to siren voices from the same religious body telling him that in all probability there is an after-death probation, or that he can

not expect the full joys of paradise after a life of evil, that he must forever take with him the evil consequences of his past life, or that accepting Jesus is not absolutely essential to salvation, &c., I say, if he hears all these contradictory teachings, the chances are that he will be discouraged and not accept the invitation at all.

In the third place it is against the broad guage plan that it tends to the destruction of all faith. It is the old story of a single leak in the dike which leads to the sweeping away of the whole. It seems to me that the conservative party in the conflict with Professor Briggs are quite right in the great importance which they attach to the issue. While having no patience with their opinions, I consider their attitude sufficiently reasonable, as long as they hold those opinions. I think there can be no reasonable doubt that the admission of the errancy of scriptures on question of science and history must result in admitting its fallibility on matter of doctrine as well. Of course they are fighting a losing fight; for they are fighting against truth. But it seems almost the only way to defend what they believe to be essential in the Christian scheme. There is great force in the contention of the Catholic church, that the true way to meet the infidelity natural to man is to stand by the *whole* of the church's teaching. In all forms of so-called evangelical Christianity there is but little that intelligent theologians attempt to defend in any other way than by an appeal to the natural incomprehensibility of the divine nature and the divine ways. Mystery, so-called, faces us on every side. To many of us it seems that *mystery* is here only a euphemism for *absurdity*. In any case the church can not afford to appeal to reason, if it would maintain what most Christians look upon as essential doctrines. This being the

case, it is dangerous to admit any modicum of heretical opinion or teaching. "Set up definite boundaries. Hold to them without a shadow of wavering. Doubt and disbelief will scoff at you for a while; but in the long run you will triumph. Man is by nature a religious animal. He can not long live without religion. After his foolish wandering he will return to the true church which alone has historic continuity, which alone has never changed, which to-day as ever holds the keys of heaven and hell." This is the reasoning of the Catholic church and it doubtless has a high degree of plausibility.

But, of course, there is another side to all this. It can be contended with a show of reason that liberality is the only condition needed to secure a rapid extension of Christianity. "Get rid," some would say, "of the mere excrescences which make Christianity offensive to an intelligent, progressive age. Admit what everybody knows in his heart to be true, that the Bible contains errors. Admit that whoever comes to God believing 'that he is and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him,' can be saved, whether he accepts the vicarious atonement or not. Put away all unnecessary subtleties. Preach the simple gospel that God is our father and man our brother; the gospel which is embodied in one glorious word—love, and the world will flock to the church as doves to their master's window." This sounds very plausible; but there is one trouble. It has not been borne out by the facts of experience. For a long time a considerable number of worthy and eloquent people have been preaching such a gospel, but there has been no flocking to their church. This of course is not decisive. It is quite possible that a general liberalizing of Christian teaching would result favorably to the propaganda of this faith. It is almost certain that without the liberalizing

which has taken place the churches would by this time have had many fewer adherents than at present. It is a generally received opinion that the Calvinistic churches particularly have maintained their position only by great practical concessions to the modern spirit. This would seem to indicate that the true way to state the argument of liberality as a help in the converting of the world, is not to declare that the broadest latitudinarianism will conduce to this result, but merely that so much of concession as is demanded by the prevailing opinions of the intelligent classes would be a powerful agency in securing the spread of religion. This, I am frank to say, is the opinion which seems to me best founded. While with some, the Roman Catholic plan of rigid adherence to the traditional faith will prove potent; with the greater number, in an age of general education and of a progressive spirit, moderate liberalism will, I believe, be practically most successful.

So much for the question whether the recognition of a limited right of dissent will be expedient or not, considered without reference to the method of granting it. We have finally to ask whether the method proposed, i. e., the *tacit recognition* of such a right, is the best one.

Against it is to be said that it savors of dishonesty, that it encourages double-dealing on the part of the member and of the minister. The practice of professing assent to a form of words, which one believes only in a sense quite different from that which the words convey to most of his hearers, can but be demoralizing.

Further, the absence of definite boundaries leads to much controversy, to legal quibbles which seem more suited to the secular courts than to the court of Jesus Christ.

Yet much is to be said in favor of this—the actual method by which heresy controversies are being settled. First, admitting the desirableness of some degree of toleration, this is certainly the only way it can be attained. General Assemblies, General Conferences, General Councils are not bodies so constituted that progressive legislation can reasonably be looked for from them. They are naturally and properly conservative. Besides, the most conservative party within them have the advantage of position. A great many Methodists play cards, and there is hardly a pastor who would venture to discipline a member for doing so. Yet what a task any man would have on his hands who should undertake to put through the General Conference a rule authorizing such practices! Similarly a great many Methodist preachers hold that there are errors in the Bible, but who would undertake to secure an amendment to the articles of religion formally legalizing such a doctrine?

But, again, not only is the tacit plan the only feasible one, it is, all things considered, the *best* one. Ecclesiastical, like political constitutions, should not be made but should grow. A change which little by little forces itself up through natural obstacles is the only sort which is likely to correspond to the real needs of the case. Human wisdom is not great enough, human virtue not strong enough, to be intrusted with the task of prevising an order of evolution. Further, changes which are accomplished by the gradual, half-concealed processes embody *real* and *permanent* rather than *apparent* and *temporary* changes in public sentiment. Formal enactment has its place. But that place is in large measure to declare and define the changes which have already been organically worked out.

What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? It is substantially this. The actual policy which the churches are

to-day working out,—the policy of by common agreement stretching the boundaries so as to give a limited toleration to new ideas, and then, as these ideas come to have common acceptance, formally incorporating them into the fundamental law,—this is the policy which the soberest wisdom would dictate. It has its dangers and drawbacks. But it is on the whole the safest and fairest. It is in fact the historic policy of the churches. It is even the policy of that church which above all others professes never to change. For in reality that church has changed and is changing to adjust itself to a changing age; only its concessions are long-delayed, are carefully hedged about, are ambiguously expressed so that the change is as far as possible concealed. As it has been in the past, so it must be in the future. The church must continue to change with the changing thought of man, must bear and forbear, must remember the words of Paul, “Him that is weak in the faith receive but not to doubtful disputation,” must above all illustrate in its own internal relations that grace which stands pre-eminent among the three—love.

THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF SOUTH AMERICA.

PROF. J. B. STEERE.

Delivered March 26, 1893.

The character and aims of this association, taken together with the subject you have given me to speak upon, make plain your object. As an association of merchants would wish to know of the productions and trade of a foreign country, that they might intelligently open new fields for their enterprise, so you are looking out to new fields for successful missionary labor.

Though the South American States are all nominally Christian, there can be no doubt, at least among Protestant Christians, that missionary labor is greatly needed there, and abundantly justified by the present religious condition of the people.

This last is certainly a matter of first importance. Proselyting where the gospel of Christ is preached with reasonable plainness and where there is an open Bible, should be abstained from by all Christians.

There can be no doubt that the Roman Catholic faith, even as preached in South America, has worked a great improvement in the native peoples of that country. One has but to pass from the christianized tribes of the coasts and great rivers, to the wild and pagan tribes of the interior, to satisfy himself that there has been both moral and material improvement.

A religion may serve a useful civilizing purpose even after

it has lost all spirituality. Doubtless some also have been able to discover the Christ through this darkened faith, and have been spiritually saved; but the Bible is generally a sealed book, and the Gospel has been so concealed in the rubbish of processions and ceremonies and image-worship, that few are able to find it. Whatever the reason, whether it be from the very character of the Roman Catholic religion or faith, or because the method of colonizing the South American States has led to such a mixture of races as is unfavorable to moral development, or because of the character of the races themselves colonizing these countries, the effect of the Roman Catholic faith upon the South American peoples has been anything but satisfactory, even to the better class of Roman Catholics themselves. We are accustomed to lay all the moral short-comings of a race to the religion it possesses. This is probably just, but let us remember that with this same judgment we and our neighbors shall be judged. It makes us Christians responsible for the saloons and gambling dens and other immoral conditions in this country.

Without interference from Protestants, and with all the influence and power of the temporal governments for its help, four hundred years of sway of the Roman Catholic church in South America has resulted in a large number of the tribes of the interior being still left pagan, and with the missionary spirit almost entirely departed from the church; while of the nominally Christian part of the population, the white portion are a race of atheists, while the Indians and Negroes, believe, it is true, but practice a faith which approaches closely to the idolatry of pagans. The church has failed utterly in bringing those who have adopted its faith up to a Christian standpoint of morals. The christianized tribes are indeed less blood-

thirsty, more industrious, and perhaps less thievish than the wild tribes; but marriage is held in little esteem, gambling, and betting, and drinking are universal, and this not alone among the colored races, but among the white people as well; in fact, these vices seem borrowed from the European colonists themselves.

In many of the interior towns, even where white blood is predominant, as in Tarapoto and Moyobamba, Peru, marriage is very rare, and a genuine system of free love, gambling, cock fighting and lotteries is so universal as to have become a part of the life of the people; and this generally without a thought of being immoral, the church itself making use of some of these methods to raise money for its support. The priests themselves, with few exceptions, live scandalous lives, sharing in the general immorality of the people.

To a much greater extent than in this country of open Bibles, these priests are the exponents of the religion they preach to the people. It will be a sorry time for the morals of any country when the people, instead of going to the fountain head of scripture for their standard, shall be compelled to find it in the lives of a degraded priesthood.

The intelligent white people of South America, seeing the immoral lives of the priests, excuse their own faults through these, and at the same time discredit the religion which has such poor representatives.

Atheism will be most prevalent where christianity does least in bettering the lives of its followers. The world makes few mistakes in its judgments of religions. To carry a pure and living faith to those who have lost sight of Christ while looking at the failures of His professed follwers, is surely as necessary as to carry it to the pagans of the east.

South America has an area of 5,700,000 square miles,

more than twice the area of the United States without Alaska. A great portion of this consists of the most fertile land on the globe, capable, when fully cultivated, of supporting a population as numerous as that of India or China. It is rapidly increasing in population, and that of people essentially Christian, at least in their traditions.

The population of South America, exclusive of the pagan and independent native tribes, but including the Indians who have embraced Christianity, number some 32,000,000, divided among the various states, as follows: Brazil, 12,000,000; Peru, 3,500,000; Colombia, 3,500,000; Chili, 3,000,000; Argentine Republic, 2,000,000; Bolivia, 2,000,000; Equador, 2,000,000; Paraguay, 2,000,000; Venezuela, 2,000,000.

These are of several races, white, Indian and Negro, and mixtures of all these in every variety. The whites number probably less than one-fourth of the whole; the Indians of pure blood may include another fourth, while the remainder are Indians and whites, and whites and Negroes. The whites are relatively most numerous in Peru, the Argentine Republic and Venezuela; the infusion of Negro blood is greatest in Brazil.

The whites are chiefly descended from Spanish and Portuguese ancestors.

The methods of colonization followed by these natives differed, and still differs radically from those with which we are familiar. The English colonists came over in families and made homes for themselves in the new country, driving back the native inhabitants and never uniting with them, and we are still accustomed to see immigrants with their families coming in the same way our ancestors came. But the Spanish and Portuguese came as adventurers, men alone, expecting in time to make their fortunes and return to the peninsula.

They undertook to make use of the native races in working the mines and cultivating the soil, instead of driving them before them, as the English did. They adopted in many ways the native styles of building, native foods, etc., and they chose concubines from the native women. The whites of these countries are generally the off-spring and descendants of these alliances.

In the hands of the white race is the political power and most of the property of the country, while the colored races are in various states of comparative independence, or semi-slavery, through a system of peonage existing in several of the various states.

The whites are in general quick-witted, active, brave, hospitable, lovers of freedom, and patriotic. Their faults, many or all of them, seem to arise from their lack of a controlling religious faith, and are, perhaps, no greater than ours would be under the same conditions, nor than those of our people in the same state of faith.

In several years of travel in South American countries I remember of meeting with but one white person, other than the priests, who acknowledged having any religious faith at all, and this was a poor mule driver in the Andes. Having lost faith in the priests, and at the same time in all that they teach, they have adopted in its place the atheism of France and Germany. Though utterly faithless, they still adhere to some of the forms of the Catholic church, and may be seen carrying a candle, or helping to carry a saint in a procession, but it is all for the looks of it, and for its effect on the people. Privately, they make sport of it all, as the Romans did of the state religion in the time of the Empire.

In curious contrast to these stand the Negroes and Indians

of pure blood. With little or no education, they remain devout Catholics, but without true teachers of Christ; they have given up pagan idolatry, only to adopt worship of images, and to fall into superstitions but little better than those from which they have been reclaimed.

On great feast days in the larger towns numbers of life-sized images of the saints, mounted on platforms, and carried on the shoulders of men, are borne in processions, with lighted tapers, through the streets, while rockets and cannons, and the ringing of bells tell to all the world that a great event is occurring. As images of special sanctity approach and pass, the on-lookers uncover their heads and kneel, so that great waves of bowing people are seen along the streets. Even the soldiers lower their muskets, take off their caps, and kneel in long lines.

The more pretentious houses have little chapels attached, in which are kept the patron saints of the family. The poorer people have a closet or cabinet containing two or three little wooden saints, dressed out in paint and tinsel, reminding one forcibly of the family saints of the Chinese.

Saint making is a regular trade in the larger towns. Whenever one of the frequent fast days occurs, those who are too far away to reach the city gather together at some convenient house and begin the holy day with prayer. The chest of saints is opened, guns are fired, candles are lighted and placed before the images, and all kneel and chant an *Ora pro nobis* in mixed Spanish and Latin, calling on all the saints of the calendar to pray for them, but doing no real praying for themselves. After this exercise, the real festivities begin with dancing, eating, and drinking, which is kept up continuously for two or three days, until all are drunk or tired out.

The result of unbelief among the higher classes, and ignorance and superstition among the lower, arrives eventually at the same end: A general state of lax morals among all.

Granting that these South Americans have need of a purer faith, what is our duty toward them?

If they ever adopt a spiritual faith which shall overcome their unbelief and ignorance, their help must come from us, or from a new revolution breaking out within the Catholic church in their midst.

The mother nations of Spain and Portugal are themselves too dark to furnish them light. Much of the Spanish hatred for the English has been inherited by these peoples of the new world. They are jealous and fearful of the great commercial nations of Europe, believing that they would willingly take advantage of their weakness. From the first we have stood in a more favorable light toward them. Our success in gaining independence no doubt stimulated them to attempt the same. With the change of the form of government in Brazil, all of the South American States adopted a form of government patterned after our own more or less closely. Our success in continued self-government has no doubt encouraged them to persevere through anarchy and revolution to the same end.

The firmness of our government in upholding the so-called "Monroe Doctrine" has been a tower of defence for all the weaker American States against European aggression. Our general policy of forming no colonies has rendered them reasonably sure that we are not proposing to absorb them by force.

The visit of the Mexican newspaper editors to the United States, and to a much greater extent the visit of the Pan-American Congress, has done much to increase the fraternal feeling and confidence in us.

The title—Americano—which they agree in giving us *par excellence*, is a passport in all parts of the country.

But not all of our relations with Spanish Americans have been as productive of confidence and good feeling as those I have mentioned. The acts of our government in the Mexican war are bitterly criticised by our southern neighbors, and patriotic Americans, unable to justify their native country, can only explain and excuse. The recent Chili affair will also add nothing to our good name. Over one hundred sailors from one of our war vessels were turned loose in the streets of Valparaiso. They sought, as is the custom of some men, and as the records of that Chilian affair show, the worst quarter of the city, among saloons and houses of ill-repute. A drunken riot arose. The Chilian courts investigated the matter, and reported that there was nothing premeditated, and that the police of the city had done what they could to quell the riot. But our government, relying on the testimony of the sailors engaged in the quarrel, threatened the little state with war, and bullied her into sending an apology and a large sum of money as recompense to the injured. This act, to them, at least, of injustice, will rankle for long years in the hearts of all South Americans and, will confront us when we are most anxious for the good will of these people.

Probably few of them are as yet discriminating enough to estimate at its true neighborly value the investigations made and the pamphlet published by our government during the last administration to aid our liquor makers and sellers to better markets in Spanish-American countries.

Our government, placing too little value upon our relations with these states, has given our embassies to them in payment for political work, and in some cases second-rate politicians of little character have represented us. While on the

west coast of South America in 1872, it was common report that our minister to Chili at that time, a former general in the civil war, was often seen drunk on the streets of Valparaiso, and was a genuine all-round bummer. .

Most of us are convinced that the unexampled prosperity of the United States depends upon its Christian virtues. We believe that the temperance, industry, economy and honesty, which are the basis of all our success, are the direct outcome of Christian faith. If we could make our South American neighbors see this, they would be as anxious to adopt our form of religion as they have been to adopt our form of government. Unfortunately this vast multitude of men and women who are trying to follow Christ, make but little show upon the surface. They do not carry their hearts upon their sleeves, and we pass them upon the streets and do not know them. In the hotels, and on the ocean steamers, and abroad, they are silent; while another class of our citizens, of easy address and manners, well dressed, with plenty of money, drink and gamble, and with mouths full of oaths and vile stories, claim to be model Americans, and to represent us; and it is this class of our people with which foreigners usually come in contact, and from which they judge us.

And yet we seem marked out by Providence to carry a renewed gospel to the despairing people.

Something has already been done in sending missionaries to South America. As long ago as 1817, Mr. Taylor, now the Methodist Episcopal Bishop for Africa, traveled along the west coast of South America, studying the opportunities for mission work, and established several self-supporting mission schools. Since then several of our various denominations have founded missions in various parts of the country.

The progress of these missions as estimated by conversions is slow. This should be expected from the nature of the field. Much can probably be done in schools where students can be brought in contact with vital Christianity as lived by these teachers.

The very fact that the ruling classes have come to disbelieve the Roman Catholic faith, and to look upon its priests as opponents of liberty and progress, makes them ready to patronize and to help support Protestant schools; but they will adopt a new faith with difficulty. They have been taught to call the Roman Catholic faith, not a form of Christianity, but Christianity itself; and they will look with suspicion at first upon any religion which calls itself Christian.

The conversion of a few of the South American students reaching this country might be the beginning of a reformation from within, which would be more successful than the surface efforts of our missionaries.

Finally, then, South America is an important portion of the world in the number and character of its inhabitants, and it is rapidly increasing in importance. Its religious state is such as to receive a new gospel, either through reformation within the existing church or through missionary efforts from without.

The field is a difficult one, one class of the people having reached such a state through unbelief that they no longer feel the need of a religion, and the other being so ignorant and bigoted that they can see nothing good in any faith but the one they now possess.

We seem, under Providence, best fitted to reach and help these our neighbors, and Protestant schools with consecrated teachers will probably be one of the factors in this great work for Christ.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 181 053 1